arXiv:1108.2306v2 [math.RT] 15 Sep 2011

Symmetric Invariants of Centralisers in Classical Lie Algebras and the KW1 Conjecture

Lewis W. Topley

Lewis.Topley@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk

Abstract

Let G denote a simple algebraic group of rank l over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{K}$ of positive characteristic p. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ and choose $x \in \mathfrak{g}$. In this paper we give explicit presentations for the invariant subalgebras $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^{G_x}$ and $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^{\mathfrak{g}_x}$ when G is of type A or C. In particular, $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^{G_x}$ is shown to be graded polynomial in l variables and $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^{\mathfrak{g}_x}$ to be the tensor product of $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^{G_x}$ with $S(\mathfrak{g}_x)^p$ over their intersection. When G is of type B or D we have $\mathfrak{gl}_m(\mathbb{K}) = \mathfrak{g} \oplus W$ where m is the dimension of the natural representation for $\mathfrak{g}$ and W is a $\mathfrak{g}$-module. In case x is nilpotent with associated partition λ we show that $S(W_x)^{G_x}$ is polynomial on $(m + |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)/2$ variables, and that $S(W_x)^{\mathfrak{g}_x}$ is the tensor product of $S(W_x)^p$ with $S(W_x)^{G_x}$ over their intersection.

For types A and C we go on to give an analogous description of the centre of the enveloping algebra $Z(\mathfrak{g}_x)$, and use this to confirm the first Kac-Weisfieler conjecture for $\mathfrak{g}_x$. As an immediate consequence we are able to give an algebraic characterisation of the singular points on the Zassenhaus variety $\mathrm{Specm}Z(\mathfrak{g}_x)$.

1 Introduction

Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Throughout this paper $\mathbb{K}$ shall denote an algebraically closed field of characteristic $p > 0$ and G shall always denote $GL_N(\mathbb{K})$, which acts by conjugation on $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{K})$. Then the conjugacy classes of nilpotent elements in $\mathfrak{g}$ lie in one to one correspondence with ordered partitions of N: to a partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ of N with $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$ we associate the G-orbit of the nilpotent element in Jordan normal form with Jordan block sizes $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$. From henceforth we fix a nilpotent element $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ with associated partition λ of length n, ordered as above. Both G and $\mathfrak{g}$ act naturally on $V = \mathbb{K}^N$ which decomposes uniquely into minimal e-stable spaces $V = \oplus_{i=1}^n V[i]$ where $\dim(V[i]) = \lambda_i$. We shall refer to the $V[i]$ as Jordan block spaces. Let G_e and $\mathfrak{g}_e$ denote the stabaliser and centraliser of e in G and $\mathfrak{g}$ respectively and let $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ denote the dual space. Thanks to [Hum], proposition 10.6 we can identify $\mathfrak{g}_e$ with $\mathrm{Lie}(G_e)$.

Let $(\cdot,\cdot) : V \oplus V \mapsto \mathbb{K}$ be a non-degenerate bilinear form fulfilling $(u, v) = \epsilon(v, u)$ where $\epsilon = \pm 1$. Let K denote the set of those $g \in G$ preserving $(\cdot,\cdot)$. If $\epsilon = 1$ then K is an orthogonal group and if $\epsilon = -1$ then K is a symplectic group. Unless otherwise stated *whenever* we discuss classical subgroups of G the characteristic of $\mathbb{K}$ shall be $p > 2$. Choose any basis for V and let J be the matrix associated to $(\cdot,\cdot)$. There is a Lie algebra automorphism $\sigma : \mathfrak{g} \mapsto \mathfrak{g}$ of order 2 taking $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ to $-J^{-1}X^T J$ which is independent of our choice of basis (here X^T denotes the transpose of X). Then σ induces a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ where $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{g}_0$ is an orthogonal algebra when $\epsilon = 1$, or symplectic algebra when $\epsilon = -1$. Furthermore $\mathfrak{g}_1$ is a $\mathfrak{k}$-module. When we discuss these classical subalgebras we assume that e is an element of $\mathfrak{k}$. In this case σ induces a similar $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{k}_e \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$

where $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 = (\mathfrak{g}_1)_e$ is a $\mathfrak{k}_e$-submodule. We have a similar decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_e^* = \mathfrak{k}_e^* \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$. Thanks to [AO], theorems 2.5&2.6 we may identify $\mathfrak{k}_e$ with $\mathrm{Lie}(K_e)$.

We shall use the above notations for making explicit calculations however it shall be convenient to unify notation occasionally. We let $\mathcal{A}$ denote a simple algebraic group of type A or C of rank l over $\mathbb{K}$ with $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{A})$ and $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Let $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]$ denote the algebra of polynomial functions on $\mathcal{L}_x^*$. It is an $\mathcal{L}_x$-module, with $\mathcal{A}_x$ acting by $\mathbb{K}$-algebra automorphisms and $\mathcal{L}_x$ acting by derivations. We shall refer to $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^p = \{f^p : f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]\}$ as the p^{th} power subalgebra of $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]$. We now state our first main theorem.

Theorem 1. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is simple of rank l, of type A or C and $x \in \mathcal{L}$ then*

1. $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{L}_x}$ *is free of rank p^l over* $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^p$*;*
2. $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{A}_x}$ *is a polynomial algebra on l generators;*
3. $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{L}_x} \cong \mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^p \otimes_{(\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^p)^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{A}_x}$.

If $\mathcal{A}$ is simple of type A or C and $s \in \mathcal{L}$ is semisimple then $\mathcal{A}_s$ is reductive of rank l, with simple factors of types A and C. Therefore the above theorem reduces to the case x nilpotent. We shall discuss some related results. In [PPY] Premet formulated the following conjecture: *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a reductive group of rank l over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and $\mathcal{L} = Lie(\mathcal{A})$. For any element $x \in \mathcal{L}$ the invariant algebra $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{A}_x}$ is graded polynomial on l generators.* As noted above the conjecture has a straightforward reduction to the case $\mathcal{L}$ simple, x nilpotent and so part 2 of theorem 1 is a suitable analogue of the above conjecture for characteristic $p > 0$. The methods of [PPY] make use of differential forms, which are inapplicable to our case. The authors went on to prove the conjecture for Lie algebras of type A and C, as well as for certain nilpotent elements in orthogonal Lie algebras. The conjecture has since been shown to fail; a long root vector in type E_8 provides a counterexample [Yak3].

Part 1 of the above theorem has its roots in a theorem of Veldkamp [Vel], theorem 3.1, where the reductive case was first proven with strong restrictions on p. In [Tan], theorem 1.6 those restrictions are weakened. Our proof is similar to that of [Tan]. The method is to satisfy the assumptions of a theorem of S. Skryabin ([Skr], theorem 5.4). We shall informally describe here a weak version of that theorem which shall be sufficient for our purposes. Let W be an $\mathcal{L}$-module and recall that the index of $\mathcal{L}$ in W is defined to be

$$\mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W) = \min_{\gamma \in W} \dim(\mathcal{L}_\gamma).$$

This definition goes back to Dixmier and plays an important role in the representation theory p-Lie algebras. We have a notion of differential $d_\gamma f$, where $\gamma \in W$, $f \in \mathbb{K}[W]$. For $f_1, ..., f_m \in \mathbb{K}[W]$ we denote by $J(f_1, ..., f_m)$ the Jacobian locus of the f_i in W, ie. the set of those $\gamma \in W$ such that the differentials $d_\gamma f_1, ..., d_\gamma f_m$ are linearly dependent. Let

$$q(\mathcal{L}, W) = \dim(W) - \dim(\mathcal{L}) + \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W).$$

Skryabin's theorem implies that if we can exhibit elements $f_1, ..., f_m \in \mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{L}}$ with $m = q(\mathcal{L}, W)$ such that $\mathrm{codim}_W J(f_1, ..., f_m) \geq 2$ then we may conclude part 1 of theorem 1. Part 2 then follows by induction and part 3 is an immediate consequence. We shall record Skryabin's theorem in full generality in the final section. In order to exhibit such polynomials we use an explicit presentation of invariants $x_1, ..., x_N \in \mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{A}_x}$, which was first conjectured in characteristic zero in [PPY], conjecture 4.1, and confirmed in section 6 of [Yak2]. In §2 of the current paper we define $x_1, ..., x_N$

in terms of combinatorial objects (Young tableau and symmetric groups) and use the results of [BB] to infer that they are G_e-invariant over $\mathbb{K}$. In [BB] this presentation of invariants was deduced from the theory of shifted Yangians and used to reprove part 2 of the above theorem in the characteristic 0 case. They went on to give explicit presentations for the generators of the centre of the enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}_e$ and thence demonstrate that the centre of the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{g}_e$ is freely generated (cf. part 1 of theorem 3 below and [Tan], theorem 1.6(iv)). §3 investigates the restriction of those polynomials to $\mathfrak{k}_e^*$ and $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$. In §4 we make use of a argument of [BB] to help us to show that the condition on the Jacobian locus of the invariants is satisfied when $\mathcal{A}$ is of type A. Those polynomials which restrict to nonzero on $\mathfrak{k}_e$ are then shown to satisfy the Jacobian locus condition for type C, and similarly those which restrict to non-zero on $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ satisfy that same condition for types B and D. We take a brief detour in §5 to prove the existence of generic stabalisers in certain modules. This result was proven for centralisers in types A and C in section 5 of [Yak1], when characteristic equals zero using a powerful criterion due to Elashvili [Ela]. This criterion does not hold in characteristic $p > 0$, however with a little extra work the same methods of proof may be applied here. We commonly write $\text{ind}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^*) = \text{ind}(\mathcal{L})$. Premet's conjecture is closely related to a conjecture of Elashvili which states that $\text{ind}(\mathcal{L}_\alpha) = \text{ind}(\mathcal{L})$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}^*$. This has been confirmed in all classical cases [Yak1] and checked using a computer by DeGraff in type E_8. Since there are so many nilpotent orbits in Lie algebras of exceptional type, the computations of the latter paper are impossible to present in a concise way. Fortunately Charbonnel and Morreau have presented an almost case free argument [CMM]. We shall call on this result in due course.

We have explained how theorem 1 in type A extends to type C. In exactly the same manner we prove the following:

Theorem 2. *Let $K \subset GL_N(\mathbb{K})$ be of type B or D and let $e \in \mathfrak{k}$ be nilpotent with associated partition λ. We have $\mathfrak{g}^* = \mathfrak{k}_e^* \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$. Let $q = (N + |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)/2$. Then*

1. *$\mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^{\mathfrak{k}_e}$ is free of rank p^q over $\mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^p$;*
2. *$\mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^{K_e}$ is a polynomial algebra on q generators;*
3. *$\mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^{\mathfrak{k}_e} \cong \mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^p \otimes_{(\mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^p)^{K_e}} \mathbb{K}[(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*]^{K_e}$.*

The remaining results concern the centres of enveloping algebras. Continue to let $\mathcal{A}$ be an algebraic group of type A or C of rank l over $\mathbb{K}$, with $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_x$ is a p-Lie algebra with p^{th}-power map $v \mapsto v^{[p]}$ induced by matrix multiplication. Let $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ denote the enveloping algebra of $\mathcal{L}_x$ and $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ the symmetric algebra. Since $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]$ are canonically isomorphic as $\mathcal{L}_x$-algebras we may identify their invariant subalgebras. Our next theorem offers a description $U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}$ and $U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{L}_x}$ analogous to the one given for symmetric invariant subalgebras. Let $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ denote the centre of $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ the p-centre (the central subalgebra of $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ generated by expressions of the form $v^p - v^{[p]}, v \in \mathcal{L}_x$). It is evident that $U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{L}_x} = Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Consider the canonical filtration on $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ with $\mathbb{K} = U^{(0)}(\mathcal{L}_x) \subset U^{(1)}(\mathcal{L}_x) \subset U^{(2)}(\mathcal{L}_x) \subset \cdots$. The associated graded algebra is $\text{gr}U(\mathcal{L}_x) \cong S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ with corresponding grading $S_k(\mathcal{L}_x) = \oplus_{i=1}^k S^i(\mathcal{L}_x)$ where $S^i(\mathcal{L}_x)$ denotes the span of homogeneous monomials of degree i in $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Since each graded $\mathcal{A}_x$-algebra is also a filtered $\mathcal{A}_x$-algebra both $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ can be seen as filtered $\mathcal{A}_x$-modules. A key ingredient in the proof of our next theorem is the existence of a filtration preserving isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}_x$-modules

$$\beta : U(\mathcal{L}_x) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathcal{L}_x)$$

such that the associated graded map $\text{gr}(\beta)$ is the identity on $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$. The isomorphism is known to exist for a large class of algebras (see [Pre], §3). We shall discuss this isomorphism in greater detail in §7. We obtain generators for $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ as the inverse images under β of the aforementioned generators for $S(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}$. We remind the reader that when $\mathcal{A}$ is of type C we make the assumption $\text{char}(\mathbb{K}) > 2$

Theorem 3. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is simple of rank l, of type A or C and $x \in \mathcal{L}$ then*

1. *$Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ is free of rank p^l over $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$;*
2. *$U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}$ is a polynomial algebra on l generators;*
3. *$Z(\mathcal{L}_x) \cong Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x) \otimes_{(Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x))^{\mathcal{A}_x}} U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}$.*

Our final result is a proof of the first Kac-Weisfeiler conjecture for centralisers in types A and C. In order to describe the conjecture in full generality we introduce a p-Lie algebra $\mathcal{M}$. It is observed in [Zas] that there is an upper bound on the dimensions of simple $\mathcal{M}$-modules. We denote by $M(\mathcal{M})$ the minimal integer such that $\dim(W) \leq M(\mathcal{M})$ for all simple $\mathcal{M}$-modules W. To each $\alpha \in \mathcal{M}^*$ we define a skew-symmetric bilinear form on $\mathcal{M}$ via the rule

$$(x, y) \mapsto \alpha[xy]$$

known as the Kirillov form associated to α. The kernel of this bilinear form coincides with $\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ so the form induces a non-degenerate skew-symmetric form on $\mathcal{M}/\mathcal{M}_\alpha$. We conclude that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{M}}\mathcal{M}_\alpha$ is an even number and in particular $\dim \mathcal{M} - \text{ind}\mathcal{M}$ is even. The KW1 conjecture asserts that

$$M(\mathcal{M}) = p^{\frac{\dim \mathcal{M} - \text{ind}\mathcal{M}}{2}}.$$

Theorem 4. *(see corollary 5) If $\mathcal{A}$ is of type A or C and $x \in \mathcal{L}$ then the KW1 conjecture holds for $\mathcal{L}_x$.*

As an addendum we compile some additional results on PI-algebras and enveloping algebras ([BG], [Zas]) to observe that the Azumaya locus of the Zassenhaus variety $\text{Specm}(Z(\mathcal{L}_x))$ is equal to the singular locus (see theorem 8). This scheme of argument here was first sketched in [PS], remark 5.2. **Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank Professor Premet for his excellent guidance throughout this research.

2 The Elementary Invariants

Retain the notations and conventions of the introduction. Let $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ be nilpotent with associated partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ and $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n > 0$. For $i = 1, ..., n$ we may choose vectors $w_i \in V[i] \backslash \text{Im}(e)$ so that $\{e^s w_i\}_{s=0}^{\lambda_i - 1}$ is a basis for the Jordan block space $V[i]$ and $\{e^s w_i : 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq s < \lambda_i\}$ is a basis for V. If we order the basis

$$(e^{\lambda_1 - 1} w_1, e^{\lambda_1 - 2} w_1, e^{\lambda_1 - 3} w_1, ..., w_1, e^{\lambda_2 - 1} w_2, e^{\lambda_2 - 2} w_2, ..., w_2, ..., w_n)$$

then e is in Jordan normal form.

Let $\xi \in \mathfrak{g}_e$. Then $\xi(e^s w_i) = e^s(\xi w_i)$ showing that ξ is determined by its action on the w_i. If we define

$$\xi_i^{j,s} w_k = \begin{cases} e^s w_j & \text{if } i = k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and extend the action to $\{e^s w_i\}$ by the requirement that $\xi_i^{j,s}$ is linear and centralises e then

$$\{\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s} : 1 \leq i,j \leq n, 0 \leq s < \min(\lambda_i,\lambda_j)\}$$

forms a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_e$. Let $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ denote the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}_e$. We define a dual basis $\{(\xi_i^{j,s})^*\}$ for $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ by setting

$$(\xi_i^{j,s})^*(\xi_k^{l,r}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i=k,\ j=l,\ s=r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The coadjoint actions of G_e and $\mathfrak{g}_e$ on $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ are defined by the rules

$$(\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\alpha)(X) = \alpha(\mathrm{Ad}(g^{-1})X) \text{ and } (\mathrm{ad}^*(Y)\alpha)(X) = -\alpha(\mathrm{ad}(Y)X)$$

for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}_e$, $g \in G_e$, $\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$. With a view to introducing the elementary symmetric invariants described in [BB] we define the sequence of invariant degrees by

$$(d_1,...,d_N) = (\overbrace{1,1,...,1}^{\lambda_1 \text{ 1's}}, \overbrace{2,...,2}^{\lambda_2 \text{ 2's}}, ..., \overbrace{n,...,n}^{\lambda_n \text{ n's}})$$

A partition (of length n) of N is a finite sequence $a = (a_1,...,a_n)$ with $\sum a_k = N$ and $0 < a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. A *composition of* a is a finite sequence $b = (b_1,...,b_n)$ with $0 \leq b_k \leq a_k$ for $k = 1,...,n$. We write $|b| = \sum b_k$ and let $l(b)$ denote the number of k for which b_k is nonzero. If $1 \leq k \leq l(b)$ then $i_k^{(b)}$ denotes the k^{th} index such that $b_{i_k} \neq 0$ (ordered so that $i_1^{(b)} \leq i_2^{(b)} \leq \cdots$). If our choice of b is clear from the context then we write $i_k = i_k^{(b)}$. Fix $r \in \{1,...,N\}$, set $d = d_r$. Denote by $\mathcal{C}_\lambda$ the set of compositions of λ fulfilling $|\mu| = r, l(\mu) = d$ and let S_d denote the symmetric group on d objects. If a choice of $w \in S_d$ and a partition μ is implicit then we write

$$s_k = \lambda_{i_{wk}^{(\mu)}} - \lambda_{i_k^{(\mu)}} + \mu_{i_k^{(\mu)}} - 1$$

Since $\mathfrak{g}_e \cong (\mathfrak{g}_e^*)^*$, $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]$ is spanned by monomials in the linear unary forms $\xi_i^{j,s} : \mathfrak{g}_e^* \mapsto \mathbb{K}$. For $r = 1,...,N$ define the functions

$$\Theta_r : S_{d_r} \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*];$$
$$\Theta_r(w,\mu) = \mathrm{sgn}(w)\xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1},s_1} \cdots \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd},s_d}.$$

Now the our elementary invariants may be defined

$$x_r = \sum_{(w,\mu)\in S_d \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda} \Theta_r(w,\mu) \in \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]. \tag{1}$$

Each x_r is homogeneous of degree d_r. Since $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]$ and $S(\mathfrak{g}_e)$ are canonically isomorphic as $\mathfrak{g}_e$-modules we may identify their invariant subalgebras. This subtlety shall allow us to relax notation occasionally.

Remark 1. *In [BB] the invariants were described in terms of a $\mathfrak{g}_e$-basis which was defined rather differently. In section 6 of [Yak2] these bases were shown to coincide. We choose this basis due to the clarity of its action on V.*

Note that all groups, spaces and maps discussed in the current section may equally well be defined over $\mathbb{C}$. The following result is implicit from [BB], theorem 4.1.

Theorem 5. *The polynomials $x_1, ..., x_N$ are G_e-invariant when defined over $\mathbb{C}$.*

We use reduction modulo p to obtain the following.

Corollary 1. *The polynomials $x_1, ..., x_N$ are G_e-invariant when defined over $\mathbb{K}$.*

Proof. We proceed with all maps and spaces defined over $\mathbb{C}$. The matrix $\xi_i^{j,s}$ is nilpotent when $i \neq j$ or $s > 0$. The elements $\xi_i^{i,0}$ are semisimple. We shall denote by $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ the ring of $N \times N$ matrices over $\mathbb{C}$ with the usual associative multiplication and denote by M_N the $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ arising from the inclusion $\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{C}$. Let t be an indeterminate and denote by $M_N(\mathbb{C})[t]$ the ring of polynomials in t with coefficients in $M_N(\mathbb{C})$. Let $i \neq j$, let $\lambda_j - \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) \leq s < \lambda_j$ and $0 < r < \lambda_i$. Consider the matrices

$$g_t = 1 + t\xi_i^{j,s} \text{ and } h_t = 1 + t\xi_i^{i,r}.$$

They both lie in $M_N(\mathbb{C})[t]$ and the reader may verify that their inverses are

$$g_t^{-1} = 1 - t\xi_i^{j,s} \text{ and } h_t^{-1} = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^k t^k \xi_i^{i,kr}.$$

Since all coefficients are integral we may consider the above maps to be elements $M_N[t]$. The elements x_r are also elements of $S(M_N)$, so we get $\mathrm{Ad}(g_t)x_r \in S(M_N[t])$. Hence the expression $\mathrm{Ad}(g_t)x_r$ can be written $A_{0,r} + tA_{1,r} + t^2 A_{2,r} + \cdots$ where $A_{k,r} \in S(M_N)$. By theorem 5 we see that x_r is g_t-stable over $\mathbb{C}$ so $A_{0,r} = x_r$ and $A_{k,r} = 0$ for all $k > 0$. Let $\tilde{A}_{k,r} = A \otimes 1 \in S(\mathfrak{gl}_N[t]) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{K}$. Then for each r we still have $\tilde{A}_{0,r} = x_r \otimes 1 \in S(M_N) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{K}$ and $\tilde{A}_{k,r} = 0$ for $k > 0$. But $x_r \otimes 1$ is just x_r deffined over $\mathbb{K}$. If we now allow t to vary over $\mathbb{K}$ then we conclude that g_t fixes each x_r over $\mathbb{K}$. Similarly each h_t fixes each x_r over $\mathbb{K}$. We proceed over $\mathbb{K}$. Let U denote the subgroup of G_e generated by the lines $\{1 + t\xi_i^{j,s} : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ and $\{1 + t\xi_i^{i,r} : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ where i, j, s and r vary in the range $i \neq j$, $\lambda_j - \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) \leq s < \lambda_j$ and $0 < r < \lambda_i$. The above shows that the generators of U fix each x_r over $\mathbb{K}$; so must the closure $\bar{U}$.

Consider the group $T \subset G$ in which the elements act on each $V[i]$ $(i = 1, ..., n)$ by an arbitrary nozero scalar. The group is toral, closed, contained in G_e and $\mathrm{Lie}(T) = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{i,0} : 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. We shall show that T fixes each x_r. Recall that $\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk}, s_k} \in \mathrm{Hom}(V[i_k], V[i_{wk}])$ so if $h \in T$ is defined by $hw_i = t_i w_i$ for $t_i \in \mathbb{K}$ then

$$\mathrm{Ad}(h)\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk}, s_k} = (t_{i_k}^{-1} t_{i_{wk}})\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk}, s_k}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ad}(h)x_r = \sum_{(w,\mu) \in S_d \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda} \mathrm{sgn}(w)\, \overbrace{(\prod_{k=1}^{d} t_{i_k}^{-1} t_{i_{wk}})}^{=1}\, \xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1}, s_1} \cdots \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd}, s_d} = x_r$$

Now the group $\langle \bar{U}, T \rangle$ generated by $\bar{U}$ and T is closed, connected and its Lie algebra contains a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_e$. Hence $\langle \bar{U}, T \rangle = G_e$. Both $\bar{U}$ and T fix x_r; so must G_e. □

3 The Restriction of Invariants to Classical Subalgebras

Define K, $\mathfrak{k}$, $(\cdot, \cdot)$, ϵ and σ as per the introduction. Recall that $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) > 2$. Let $e \in \mathfrak{k}$ be a nilpotent element and, as usual, denote the Jordan block sizes by $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n$. Recall that there exist vectors $\{w_i\}$ such that $\{e^s w_i : 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq s < \lambda_i\}$ forms a basis for V. The following condition on the Jordan block sizes can be found in [AO], theorem 1.4.

Lemma 1. *The $w_i \in V$ can be chosen so that there exists an involution $i \mapsto i'$ on the set $\{1, ..., n\}$ such that*

1. $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i'}$ *for all* $i = 1, ..., n$
2. $i = i'$ *if and only if* $(-1)^{\lambda_i - 1} = \epsilon$

In plain English the lemma implies that for a nilpotent element in a symplectic algebra, each Jordan block of odd dimension can be paired with a different Jordan block of the same dimension, and in an orthogonal algebra each Jordan block of even dimension can be paired with a different Jordan block of the same dimension. Since $\sigma(e) = e$, the centraliser of e in $\mathfrak{g}$ is σ-stable, inducing a decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{k}_e \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ where $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 = (\mathfrak{g}_1)_e$ is a $\mathfrak{g}_e$-module. We have a corresponding decomposition of the dual space $\mathfrak{g}_e^* = \mathfrak{k}_e^* \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$. Finally we shall normalise the basis for V. Let $\{w_i\}$ be chosen in accordance with the above lemma. Fix i. We have $(e^s w_i, w_{i'}) = (-1)^s (w_i, e^s w_{i'})$ so $e^{\lambda_i - 1} w_i$ is orthogonal to all $e^s w_{i'}$ with $s > 0$. There is a (unique upto scalar) vector $v \in V[i]$ which is orthogonal to all $e^s w_{i'}$ for $s < \lambda_i - 1$. This v does not lie in $\mathrm{Im}(e)$ for otherwise it would be othogonal to all of $V[i] + V[i']$. This of course is not possible since the restriction of $(\cdot, \cdot)$ to $(V[i] + V[i']) \times (V[i] + V[i'])$ is non-degenerate. It does no harm to replace w_i by v and normalise according to the rule

$$(w_i, e^{\lambda_i - 1} w_{i'}) = 1 \quad \text{whenever } i \leq i'$$

With respect to this basis the matrix of the restriction of $(\cdot, \cdot)$ to $V[i] + V[i']$ is antidiagonal with entries ±1. We now describe a spanning set for $\mathfrak{k}_e$. We have

$$\sigma(\xi_i^{j, \lambda_j - 1 - s}) = \varepsilon_{i,j,s} \xi_{j'}^{i', \lambda_i - 1 - s} \tag{2}$$

where $\varepsilon_{i,j,s}$ is defined by the following relationship [Yak2]

$$(e^{\lambda_j - 1 - s} w_j, e^s w_{j'}) = -\varepsilon_{i,j,s} (w_i, e^{\lambda_i - 1} w_{i'})$$

Make the notations

$$\partial_{i \leq j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \leq j \\ -1 & \text{if } i > j \end{cases}$$

$$\zeta_i^{j,s} = \xi_i^{j, \lambda_j - 1 - s} + \varepsilon_{i,j,s} \xi_{j'}^{i', \lambda_i - 1 - s}$$

$$\eta_i^{j,s} = \xi_i^{j, \lambda_j - 1 - s} - \varepsilon_{i,j,s} \xi_{j'}^{i', \lambda_i - 1 - s}.$$

The maps $\zeta_i^{j,s}$ span $\mathfrak{k}_e$ and the maps $\eta_i^{j,s}$ span $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$. We can construct a dual basis in a similar manner as section 1. Let

$$(\zeta_i^{j,s})^* (\zeta_k^{l,r}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = k, j = l, s = r \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

The reader may check that the explicit presentation of this dual basis is $(\zeta_i^{j,s})^* = (\xi_i^{j, \lambda_j - 1 - s})^* + \varepsilon_{i,j,s} (\xi_{j'}^{i', \lambda_i - 1 - s})^*$ (this actually follows from part 3 of the next lemma). A similar description may be given for $(\eta_i^{j,s})^*$. The $(\zeta_i^{j,s})^*$ vanish on $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ and the $(\eta_i^{j,s})^*$ vanish on $\mathfrak{k}_e$.

Lemma 2. *The following are true:*

1. $\varepsilon_{i,j,s} = (-1)^{\lambda_j - s} \partial_{i \leq i'} \partial_{j \leq j'}$;

2. $\varepsilon_{i,j,s} = \varepsilon_{j',i',s}$;

3. *The only linear relations amongst the* $\zeta_i^{j,s}$ *are those of the form* $\zeta_i^{j,s} = \varepsilon_{i,j,s}\zeta_{j'}^{i',s}$.

4. *The only linear relations amongst the* $\eta_i^{j,s}$ *are those of the form* $\eta_i^{j,s} = -\varepsilon_{i,j,s}\eta_{j'}^{i',s}$.

Proof. We have

$$\varepsilon_{i,j,s} = \frac{-(e^{\lambda_j-1-s}w_j, e^s w_{j'})}{(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'})} = \frac{(-1)^{\lambda_j-s}(w_j, e^{\lambda_j-1}w_{j'})}{(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'})}.$$

We claim that $(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'}) = \partial_{i\leq i'}$. The bilinear form $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is normalised so that $(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'}) = 1$ whenever $i \leq i'$, therefore we need only show that $(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'}) = -1$ whenever $i > i'$. If $i > i'$ then

$$(w_i, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_{i'}) = (-1)^{\lambda_i-1}(e^{\lambda_i-1}w_i, w_{i'}) = \epsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i-1}(w_{i'}, e^{\lambda_i-1}w_i) = \epsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i-1}.$$

However $\epsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i-1} = -1$ whenever $i \neq i'$ by lemma 1, conculding part 1. Next observe that $\partial_{i\leq i'}\partial_{i'\leq i} = 1$ if and only if $i = i'$ hence $\partial_{i\leq i'}\partial_{i'\leq i} = \epsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i-1}$. Part 2 now follows from part 1.

The equality $\zeta_i^{j,s} = \varepsilon_{i,j,s}\zeta_{j'}^{i',s}$ follows from part 2. To see that these are the only relations we note that $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ is spanned by vectors $\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s} - \varepsilon_{i,j,s}\xi_{j'}^{i',\lambda_i-1-s}$ and that $\mathfrak{g}_e/(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 \cong \mathfrak{k}_e$. Then the map $\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s} + (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 \mapsto \zeta_i^{j,s}$ is well defined and extends to a linear map $\mathfrak{g}_e/(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 \mapsto \mathfrak{k}_e$. It is surjective and so by dimension considerations it is a vector space isomorphism. The only linear relations amongst the vectors $\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s} + (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ in $\mathfrak{g}_e/(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ are those of the form $\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s} - \varepsilon_{i,j,s}\xi_{j'}^{i',\lambda_i-1-s} + (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 = 0$. Part 3 follows. An identical argument works for part 4. ☐

Fix $r \in \{1, ..., N\}$ and $d = d_r$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}_\lambda$ denotes the set of compositions of λ fulfilling both $|\mu| = r$ and $l(\mu) = d$, and that $\Theta_r(w,\mu) = \mathrm{sgn}(w)\xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1},s_1}\cdots\xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd}s_d}$ where $s_k = \lambda_{i_{wk}} - \lambda_{i_k} + \mu_{i_k} - 1$. The invariants described in section 1 are defined to be

$$x_r = \sum_{(w,\mu)\in S_d\times\mathcal{C}_\lambda} \Theta_r(w,\mu) \in \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]^{G_e}. \tag{3}$$

Since $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]$ is spanned by monomials in the $\xi_i^{j,s}$, the involution $\sigma : \mathfrak{g}_e \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_e$ extends uniquely to a $\mathbb{K}$-algebra automorphism of $\mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*] \mapsto \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]$ which we shall also denote by σ. This extension is clearly involutory. The following proposition shall be pivotal to our understanding of the symmetric invariants for centralisers of nilpotent elements in classical subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$.

Proposition 1. $\sigma(x_r) = (-1)^r x_r$

Proof. Fix $(w,\mu) \in S_d \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda$. We shall show that if $\Theta_r(w,\mu) \neq 0$ then there exists a pair $(w',\mu') \in S_d \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda$ such that $\sigma(\Theta_r(w,\mu)) = (-1)^r\Theta_r(w',\mu')$ and $\Theta_r(w',\mu') \neq 0$. In view of formula (3) the proposition shall follow. By formula (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(\Theta_r(w,\mu)) &= \mathrm{sgn}(w)\sigma(\xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1},s_1}\cdots\xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd},s_d}) \\ &= (\prod_{k=1}^{d}\varepsilon_{i_k,i_{wk},\lambda_{i_k}-\mu_{i_k}})\mathrm{sgn}(w)\xi_{(i_{w1})'}^{(i_1)',\mu_{i_1}-1}\cdots\xi_{(i_{wd})'}^{(i_d)',\mu_{i_d}-1}\end{aligned}$$

We must examine the coefficient

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{k=1}^{d}\varepsilon_{i_k,i_{wk},\lambda_{i_k}-\mu_{i_k}} &= \prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\lambda_{i_{wk}}-\lambda_{i_k}+\mu_{i_k}}\partial_{i_k\leq i'_k}\partial_{i_{wk}\leq i'_{wk}} \\ &= (\prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\lambda_{i_k}}\partial_{i_k\leq i'_k})(\prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\lambda_{i_{wk}}}\partial_{i_{wk}\leq i'_{wk}})(\prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\mu_{i_k}})\end{aligned}$$

By definition $|\mu| = r$ implies $\prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\mu_{i_k}} = (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{d}\mu_{i_k}} = (-1)^r$. Since w is a permutation $\prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\lambda_{i_k}}\partial_{i_k\leq i'_k} = \prod_{k=1}^{d}(-1)^{\lambda_{i_{wk}}}\partial_{i_{wk}\leq i'_{wk}}$ and the product $\prod_{k=1}^{d}\varepsilon_{i_k,i_{wk},\lambda_{i_k}-\mu_{i_k}}$ reduces to $(-1)^r$.

It remains to prove that $\Theta_r(w',\mu') = \operatorname{sgn}(w)\xi_{(i_{w1})'}^{(i_1)',s_1+\lambda_{i_1}-\lambda_{i_{w1}}}\cdots\xi_{(i_{wd})'}^{(i_d)',s_d+\lambda_{i_d}-\lambda_{i_{wd}}}$ for some choice of $(w',\mu') \in S_d \times \mathcal{C}_\lambda$. For $k = 1,...,d$ let $j_k = (i_{wk})'$. Let μ' be the composition of λ with nonzero entries in positions indexed by the j_k such that $\mu'_{j_k} = \mu_{i_k} + \lambda_{i_{wk}} - \lambda_{i_k}$. We have $l(\mu') = d$ by definition. Furthermore

$$|\mu'| = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\mu'_{j_k} = \sum_{i=1}^{k}(\mu_{i_k} + \lambda_{i_{wk}} - \lambda_{i_k}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k}\mu_{i_k} = |\mu| = r.$$

To see that $0 \leq \mu'_k \leq \lambda_k$ we use the fact that $\Theta_r(w,\mu) \neq 0$. We have $0 \leq \lambda_{i_{wk}} - 1 - s_k \leq \min(\lambda_{i_k}, \lambda_{i_{wk}})$ and by definition of s_k we have $0 \leq \lambda_{i_k} - \mu_{i_k} \leq \lambda_{i_{wk}}$. The left hand inequality gives us $\mu'_{j_k} \leq \lambda_{i_{wk}} = \lambda_{j_k}$, whilst the right hand inequality tells us that $0 \leq \lambda_{i_{wk}} - (\lambda_{i_k} - \mu_{i_k}) = \mu'_{j_k}$. It follows that $0 \leq \mu'_k \leq \lambda_k$ for $k = 1,...,n$ so that μ' is a composition of λ. We have shown that $\mu' \in \mathcal{C}_\lambda$.

We now aim to define $w' \in S_d$. If we define an element $\omega \in S_n$ by $\omega(i_k) = i_{wk}$ for $k = 1,...,d$ and $\omega(i) = i$ for all $\mu_i = 0$, then $\operatorname{sgn}(\omega) = \operatorname{sgn}(w)$. The element ν of S_n which sends $(i_{wk})'$ to $(i_k)'$ is $'\circ\omega^{-1}\circ'$, where $\circ$ denotes composition of permutations in S_n. But $'$ is an involution so ν and ω^{-1} are conjugate in S_n implying $\operatorname{sgn}(\nu) = \operatorname{sgn}(\omega)$. Now ν preserves the set $\{j_1,...,j_d\}$ and acts trivially on its complement, therefore we may take w' to be the restriction of ν to $\{j_1,...,j_d\}$. This element will have $\operatorname{sgn}(w') = \operatorname{sgn}(\nu) = \operatorname{sgn}(\omega) = \operatorname{sgn}(w)$.

From the above we get $j_{w'k} = \nu(i_{wk})' = (i_k)'$, $\mu'_{j_k} = \mu'_{(i_{wk})'} = \mu_{i_k} + \lambda_{i_{wk}} - \lambda_{i_k}$, $\lambda_{j_{w'k}} = \lambda_{i_k}$ and $\lambda_{j_k} = \lambda_{i_{wk}}$ so that

$$\xi_{j_k}^{j_{w'k},\lambda_{j_{w'k}}-\lambda_{j_k}+\mu'_{j_k}-1} = \xi_{(i_{wk})'}^{(i_k)',\mu_{i_k}-1}.$$

It follows that (w',μ') is the required pair. Since σ is non-degenerate on $\mathfrak{g}_e$ and $\Theta_r(w',\mu')$ is a product of terms $\sigma(\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk},s_k})$ with each $\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk},s_k} \neq 0$ we conclude that $\Theta_r(w',\mu') \neq 0$. □

As an immediate corollary we get

Corollary 2. *The following are true:*

1. $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = 0$ *for* r *odd;*
2. $x_r|_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*} = 0$ *for* $r + d_r$ *odd.*

Proof. Let B_0 be a basis for $\mathfrak{k}_e$ and B_1 a basis for $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$, so that $B_0 \cup B_1$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{g}_e$. Throughout the proof we shall consider x_r as a sum of monomials in $B_0 \cup B_1$. With respect to this basis x_r remains to be homogeneous of degree d_r. Since the elements of this basis are eigenvectors for σ the monomials will be eigenvectors for the extension of σ to $S(\mathfrak{g}_e)$.

If r is odd then by proposition 1, $\sigma x_r = -x_r$. We deduce that there are an odd (ie. nonzero) number of factors from B_1 in each monomial summand of x_{2r-1}. Each of these factors restricts to zero on $\mathfrak{k}_e^*$; so must x_r, whence (1).

If $r + d_r$ is odd then there are two possibilities: either r is odd and d_r even or vice versa. Assume the former so that x_r is a sum of monomials of even degree and $\sigma x_r = -x_r$. There must be an odd number of factors from B_1 in each monomial and since each monomial has even degree there is also an odd (ie. nonzero) number of factors from B_1 in each monomial. Each of these factors restrict to zero on $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$, so must x_r. If, on the other hand, r is even and d_r is odd then $\sigma x_r = x_r$ so each monomial summand of x_r contains an even number of factors from B_1. Since each such monomial has odd degree, there is an odd (ie. nonzero) number of factors from B_0 in each monomial. Each of these factors restrict to zero on $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$, so must x_r. This completes the proof. ☐

4 Jacobian Loci of the Invariants

4.1 The General Linear Case

If $f_1, ..., f_l \in \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*]$ and $U \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ is a subspace then we denote by $J_U(f_i : i = 1, ..., l)$ the Jacobian locus of the f_i in U, ie. those $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ for which the differentials $d_\gamma f_1|_U, ..., d_\gamma f_l|_U$ are linearly dependent. Make the notation $J = J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_r : r = 1, ..., N)$. We aim to show that the condition on the codimension of the Jacobian locus in Skryabin's theorem is satisfied for these invariants. Refer to the introduction for an informal description of Skryabin's theorem. We shall prove the following.

Proposition 2. $\operatorname{codim}_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*} J \geq 2$.

In the style of [PPY], §3, we proceed by identifying a 2-dimensional plane in $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ intersecting J only at 0. The proposition will then quickly follow. Calculating the differentials of the invariants polynomials explicitly is an unappealing task, and so we infer the necessary properties implicitly. Fix $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ and let $v \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ vary. Consider the polynomial

$$x_r^\gamma : \mathfrak{g}_e^* \mapsto \mathbb{K}; v \mapsto x_r(\gamma + v).$$

It is well known and easily seen that

$$x_r^\gamma = \text{ constant } + d_\gamma x_r + \text{ higher degree polynomials in } \mathbb{K}[\mathfrak{g}_e^*] \tag{4}$$

Hence in order to show that $d_\gamma x_1, ..., d_\gamma x_N$ are linearly independent it will suffice to show that the linear components of $x_1^\gamma|_U, ..., x_N^\gamma|_U$ are linearly independent for some appropriate choice of vector space $U \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_e^*$.

Let us define

$$\alpha = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i (\xi_i^{i, \lambda_i - 1})^* \text{ and } \beta = \sum_{i=2}^{n} (\xi_{i-1}^{i, \lambda_i - 1})^* \tag{5}$$

where the coefficients $a_i \in \mathbb{K}$ are subject to the constraint that $a_i = a_j$ implies $i = j$. The following lemma is essentially due to Brown and Brundan [BB], lemma 4.2. Their paper makes use of a basis which is defined combinatorially, and uses the reverse ordering for the Jordan block sizes. We translate their argument into the notation of our basis $\{\xi_i^{j,s}\}$ for the reader's convenience.

Lemma 3. *For all $y \in \mathbb{K}^\times$ we have $y\beta \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J$.*

Proof. Let $U = \operatorname{span}\{(\xi_i^{1,s})^* : 1 \leq i \leq n, \lambda_1 - \lambda_i \leq s < \lambda_1\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ and let

$$v = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{s=\lambda_1 - \lambda_i}^{\lambda_1 - 1} c_{i,s} (\xi_i^{1,s})^*$$

be an arbitrary element of U, with $c_{i,s} \in \mathbb{K}$. We have

$$\xi_i^{j,s}(y\beta + v) = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } i = j - 1 \text{ and } s = \lambda_j - 1 \\ c_{i,s} & \text{if } j = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Observe that if $1 \le r \le \lambda_1$ then $x_r = \sum_i \xi_i^{i,r-1}$ so that $x_r(y\beta + v) = c_{1,r-1}$ and $x_r^{y\beta}|_U = \xi_1^{1,r-1}$. If $n = 1$ then $\lambda_1 = N$ and we have shown that the linear terms of the $x_1^{y\beta}|_U, ..., x_N^{y\beta}|_U$ are linearly independent and by formula (4) we are done. Assume not, so that we may choose $\lambda_1 < r \le N$ and by definition we shall have $d = d_r > 1$. With the definition of x_r in mind let us consider the possible choice of composition μ of λ, and permutation $w \in S_d$ such that the monomial $\xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1},s_1} ... \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd},s_d}$ evaluates as nonzero at v. We require that $\xi_{i_k}^{i_{wk},s_k}(v) \neq 0$ for $k = 1, ..., d$.

For any $w \in S_d$ we can be sure that $wk \le k$ for some $k \in \{1, ..., d\}$. Fix such a k. Due to (6) we have $i_{wk} = 1$. Clearly $wl \neq 1$ for $l \neq k$ so, again by (6), $i_{wl} = i_l + 1$ for all $l \neq k$. This gives us $i_{wk} = 1$, $i_{w^2k} = 2$, $i_{w^3k} = 3, ...$ and $i_{w^dk} = i_k = d$. Furthermore by (6) we must have $\mu_1 = \lambda_1, \mu_2 = \lambda_2, ..., \mu_{d-1} = \lambda_{d-1}$. Since $|\mu| = r$ and $l(\mu) = d$ we have $\mu_d = r - \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \lambda_m$. The upshot is that w must be the d-cycle $(123 \cdots d)$ and that the composition μ must be $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_{d-1}, r - \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \lambda_k, 0, 0, ..., 0)$.

We make the notation $t_r = r - \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} \lambda_m \in \{1, ..., \lambda_d\}$. Since $\mathrm{sgn}(123 \cdots d) = (-1)^{d-1}$ we have shown that $x_r(y\beta + v) = (-y)^{d-1} c_{d,t_r-1}$. Thus $x_r^{y\beta}|_U = (-y)^{d-1} \xi_d^{1,t_r-1}|_U$ for all $r = 1, ..., N$. These linear functions are clearly linearly independent and by formula (4) the lemma is proven. ☐

Lemma 4. *There exists $g \in G_e$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\alpha = \alpha + \beta$.*

Proof. We may decompose the algebra $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ where $\mathfrak{n}^- = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i < j\}$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i = j\}$ and $\mathfrak{n}^+ = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i > j\}$ $(\lambda_j - \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_j) \le s < \lambda_j)$. If we order the basis $\{e^s w_i\}$ so that e is in Jordan normal form then $\mathfrak{n}^-$ is strictly lower triangular and $\mathfrak{n}^+$ is strictly upper triangular. Furthermore we have a similar decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_e^* = (\mathfrak{n}^-)^* \oplus \mathfrak{h}^* \oplus (\mathfrak{n}^+)^*$ where $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $\beta \in (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$. Since each $X \in \mathfrak{n}^+$ is nilpotent, the translation morphism $X \mapsto 1 + X$ takes $X \in \mathfrak{n}^+$ to a unipotent matrix in G_e. We denote the subgroup generated by all $1 + X$ $(X \in \mathfrak{n}^+)$ by N^+. It is easily seen that $1 + \mathfrak{n}^+$ is closed under matrix multiplication, hence $N^+ = 1 + \mathfrak{n}^+$. We aim to prove that $\mathrm{Ad}^*(N^+)\alpha = \alpha + (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$, from which our proposition will quickly follow. The 1-dimensional subspaces $\{1 + t\xi_i^{j,s} : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ with $i > j$ generate N^+. Since $i > j$ we see that $(1 + t\xi_i^{j,s})^{-1} = 1 - t\xi_i^{j,s}$ (cf. proof of corollary 1). A quick calculation then shows that

$$\mathrm{Ad}^*(1 + t\xi_i^{j,s})\alpha = \alpha + t(a_j(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - a_i(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^*) \in \alpha + (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$$

The conditions on the a_i ensure that the linear forms $\{a_j(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - a_i(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^* : i > j\}$ are linearly independent, hence span $(\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$. We see that $\dim(\mathrm{Ad}^*(N^+)\alpha) = \dim(\alpha + (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*)$. Thanks to [Ros], theorem 2, we know that $\mathrm{Ad}^*(N^+)\alpha$ is a closed subvariety of $\alpha + (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$. The dimensions coincide and so we have equality $\mathrm{Ad}^*(N^+)\alpha = \alpha + (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$. Now $\beta \in (\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$ so there exists some $g \in N^+$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\alpha = \alpha + \beta$ as required. ☐

Let $a : \mathbb{K}^\times \mapsto G_e$ be the cocharacter given by $a(t)w_i = t^i w_i$. Define a rational linear action $\rho : \mathbb{K}^\times \mapsto GL(\mathfrak{g}_e^*)$ by

$$\rho(t)\gamma = t\mathrm{Ad}^*(a(t))\gamma \text{ where } \gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*, t \in \mathbb{K}^\times$$

Clearly we have $\rho(t)(\xi_i^{j,s})^* = t^{i-j+1}(\xi_i^{j,s})^*$.

Lemma 5. *The Jacobian locus J is*

1. *G_e-stable;*

2. *$\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)$-stable.*

Proof. Since x_r is G_e-invariant

$$x_r(Ad^*(g)(\gamma + \delta)) = x_r(\gamma + \delta)$$

for all $g \in G_e$ and $\gamma, \delta \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$. This equates to $x_r^{\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma} \circ (\mathrm{Ad}^* g) = x_r^{\gamma}$. The linear part of the left hand side of this equation is $d_{\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma} x_r \circ (\mathrm{Ad}^* g)$ and the same of the right hand side is $d_\gamma x_r$. As $\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)$ is invertible, the dimension of the linear span of $d_{\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma} x_1, ..., d_{\mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma} x_N$ equals that of the $d_\gamma x_1, ..., d_\gamma x_N$, whence (1).

Turning our attention to $\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)$, fix $t \in \mathbb{K}^\times$ and observe that

$$(\xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1}, s_1} ... \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd}, s_d}) \circ \rho(t) = (\prod_{k=1}^{d} t^{i_k - i_{wk} + 1}) \xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1}, s_1} ... \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd}, s_d} = t^d \xi_{i_1}^{i_{w1}, s_1} ... \xi_{i_d}^{i_{wd}, s_d}.$$

So that $x_r \circ \rho(t) = t^d x_r$. Next let $\gamma, v \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ and observe that

$$x_r(\rho(t)\gamma + v) = x_r \circ \rho(t)(\gamma + \rho(t)^{-1} v) = t^d x_r(\gamma + \rho(t)^{-1} v)$$

which may be written as $x_r^{\rho(t)\gamma} = t^d x_r^\gamma \circ \rho(t)^{-1}$. We conclude that the linear terms must coincide, so that

$$d_{\rho(t)\gamma} x_r = t^d d_\gamma x_r \circ \rho(t)^{-1}.$$

However, $\rho(t)^{-1}$ is evidently invertible so (2) follows. ☐

Lemma 6. $(\mathbb{K}\alpha \oplus \mathbb{K}\beta) \cap J = 0$

Proof. Let $x, y \in \mathbb{K}$ and $\gamma = x\alpha + y\beta \neq 0$. We shall show that $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J$. If $y = 0$ then the element $g \in G_e$ constructed in lemma 4 sends γ to $x\alpha + x\beta$ so by part 1 of lemma 5 it suffices to prove that $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J$ whenever $y \neq 0$. By lemma 3 we may assume that $x \neq 0$.

It is clear that $\rho(t)\alpha = t\alpha$ and $\rho(t)\beta = \beta$. Consider the variety $\mathbb{K}\alpha + y\beta$. Since J is closed it follows that $(\mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J) \cap (\mathbb{K}\alpha + y\beta)$ is a Zariski open subset of $\mathbb{K}\alpha + y\beta$. By lemma 3 that intersection is non-empty. We deduce that

$$\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)\gamma \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J) = (\mathbb{K}^\times \alpha + y\beta) \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J) \neq \emptyset.$$

By part 2 of lemma 5, $\mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J$ is $\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)$-stable implying $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* \backslash J$ as required.

☐

We are now ready to prove proposition 2.

Proof. The Jacobian locus is conical and Zariski closed. Apply the above lemma. ☐

4.2 The Symplectic and Orthogonal Cases

In this section we aim to prove an analogue of proposition 2 for centralisers in symplectic algebras and orthogonal algebras.

Proposition 3. *The following are true:*

1. *Let $\epsilon = -1$ so that K is of type C. Then $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even}) \geq 2$;*

2. *Let $\epsilon = 1$ so that K is of type B or D. Then $\mathrm{codim}_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*} J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even}) \geq 2$.*

The proofs of parts (1) and (2) shall be identical. We begin by proving (1) and then describe how those arguments may be adapted to part (2). As an immediate corollary we obtain.

Corollary 3. *The following are true:*

1. *If $\epsilon = -1$ then the restrictions $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ with r even are non-zero and distinct;*
2. *If $\epsilon = 1$ then the restrictions $x_r|_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}$ with $r + d_r$ even are non-zero and distinct.*

Proof. If $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = x_s|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ for some $r \neq s$ then we would have $\mathfrak{k}_e^* = J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even})$, contradicting part 1 of proposition 3. Similarly the restrictions are non-zero. The same argument works for part 2. $\square$

Until stated otherwise assume $\epsilon = -1$. Since $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{k}_e \oplus (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ there is a natural inclusion $i : S(\mathfrak{k}_e) \mapsto S(\mathfrak{g}_e)$ which is also a $\mathbb{K}$-algebra homomorphism.

Lemma 7. $d_\gamma x_r = d_\gamma i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*})$ *for r even and for all* $\gamma \in \mathfrak{k}_e^*$.

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \mathfrak{k}_e^*$. Let B_0 and B_1 be bases for $\mathfrak{k}_e$ and $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ respectively. The polynomial $x_r - i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*})$ may be written as a finite sum $\sum_{k=1}^m c_k M_k$ where $c_i \in \mathbb{K}^\times$ and the M_k are monomials in the $\mathfrak{g}_e$-basis $B_0 \cup B_1$. Since $i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*})$ is the sum of those monomial summands of x_r which contain no factors from B_1 we conclude that each M_k possesses a factor from B_1. We have $\sigma X = -X$ for each $X \in B_1$ and, since r is even, $\sigma x_r = x_r$ by proposition 1 so there must be an even number of factors from B_1 in each monomial summand of x_r. This implies that each M_k possesses at least two factors from B_1 and that for all $X \in B_0 \cup B_1$ the partial derivative $\frac{\partial M_k}{\partial X}$ either is zero or possesses at least one nonzero factor from B_1. The functions B_1 annihilate $\mathfrak{k}_e^*$ so $\frac{\partial M_k}{\partial X}(\gamma) = 0$ for all $X \in B_0 \cup B_1$. But now

$$d_\gamma(x_r - i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*})) = \sum_{X \in B_0 \cup B_1} \frac{\partial(x_r - i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}))}{\partial X}(\gamma) X = \sum_{X \in B_0 \cup B_1} \sum_{k=1}^m c_k \frac{\partial M_k}{\partial X}(\gamma) X = 0.$$

The lemma follows. $\square$

Lemma 8. $J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \textit{ even}) = \mathfrak{k}_e^* \cap J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_r : r \textit{ even})$

Proof. Fix $\gamma \in \mathfrak{k}_e^*$. If $\sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma x_r = 0$ then $(\sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma x_r)|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = \sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma (x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}) = 0$ which gives one inclusion. Conversely suppose $\sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma (x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}) = 0$. Then $i(\sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma (x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*})) = \sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma i(x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}) = \sum_{r \text{ even}} c_r d_\gamma x_r = 0$, which gives the other inclusion. $\square$

Let α be as defined in the previous section, with the additional constraint that $a_i = -a_{i'}$ for all $i \neq i'$. We define

$$\bar{\beta} = \beta + \beta' \text{ where } \beta' = \sum_{i+1 \neq i'} \varepsilon_{i,i+1,0} (\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i - 1})^*$$

Recall that $J = J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_1, ..., x_N)$ and that there is a rational linear action $\rho : \mathbb{K}^\times \mapsto GL(\mathfrak{g}_e^*)$ defined preceding lemma 4. Note that if $i + 1 \neq i'$ then $(i+1)' > i'$ and so

$$\rho(t)(\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i - 1})^* = t^{k_i} (\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i - 1})^*$$

where $k_i = (i+1)' - i' + 1 \geq 2$.

Lemma 9. $\alpha, \bar{\beta} \in \mathfrak{k}_e^*$.

Proof. We recall that $(\zeta_i^{j,s})^* = (\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s})^* + \varepsilon_{i,j,s}(\xi_{j'}^{i',\lambda_i-1-s})^*$ and $\varepsilon_{i,i,0} = (-1)^{\lambda_i}$. Since $\epsilon = -1$, lemma 1 implies that $i = i'$ if and only if λ_i is even. Therefore $(\zeta_i^{i,0})^* = 2(\xi_i^{i,\lambda_i-1})^*$ for all $i = i'$ and $(\zeta_i^{i,0})^* = (\xi_i^{i,\lambda_i-1})^* - (\xi_{i'}^{i',\lambda_i-1})^*$ for all $i < i'$. It follows that $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=i'} a_i(\zeta_i^{i,0})^* + \sum_{i<i'} a_i(\zeta_i^{i,0})^*$.

Similarly $\varepsilon_{i,i+1,0} = (-1)^{\lambda_{i+1}}\partial_{i\leq i'}\partial_{i+1\leq(i+1)'}$. If $i+1 = i'$ then lemma 1 implies λ_{i+1} is odd and that $\varepsilon_{i,i+1,0} = 1$. We conclude that $(\zeta_i^{i+1,0})^* = 2(\xi_i^{i+1,\lambda_{i+1}-1})^*$ from whence it follows that $\bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i+1=i'}(\zeta_i^{i+1,0})^* + \sum_{i+1\neq i'}(\zeta_i^{i+1,0})^*$. ☐

Lemma 10. $(\mathbb{K}\alpha \oplus \mathbb{K}\bar{\beta}) \cap J = 0$

Proof. Let $\gamma = x\alpha + y\bar{\beta} \neq 0$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{K}$. We shall show that $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*\backslash J$. Supposing $x \neq 0$ and $y = 0$ we may invoke lemma 6 to conclude that $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*\backslash J$.

Suppose $y \neq 0$, then consider the set $E = \{t\alpha + (\beta + \sum \varepsilon_{i,i+1,0}t^{k_i}\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i-1}) : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ where $k_i \in \mathbb{N}$ is defined preceding the statement of lemma 9. It is a 1-dimenisonal variety containing β, hence by lemma 3 it must intersect the set $\mathfrak{g}_e^*\backslash J$ in a non-empty open subset. Since $\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)\gamma = \{t\alpha + (\beta + \sum \varepsilon_{i,i+1,0}t^{k_i}\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i-1}) : t \in \mathbb{K}^\times\} \subseteq E$ is also non-empty and open in E the intersection $\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)\gamma \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e^*\backslash J)$ is non-empty. By part 2 of lemma 5, J is $\rho(\mathbb{K}^\times)$-stable and so $\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*\backslash J$.

☐

We can now give a proof for part (1) of proposition 3.

Proof. By lemmas 9 and 10 there is a 2 dimensional plane contained in $\mathfrak{k}_e^*$ intersecting J only at zero. By lemma 8 we have $J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even}) = \mathfrak{k}_e^* \cap J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even}) \subseteq \mathfrak{k}_e^* \cap J$ so that same plane intersects $J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even})$ only at zero. As $J_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}(x_r : r \text{ even})$ is conical and Zariski closed, the proposition follows. ☐

In order to prove part (2) of the same proposition we shall describe how the argument above must be adapted to the orthogonal cases. *For the remainder of this section take* $\epsilon = 1$. Again we have an inclusion $i : S((\mathfrak{g}_e)_1) \mapsto S(\mathfrak{g}_e)$. The next lemma is analogous to lemma 8.

Lemma 11. $J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \textit{ even}) = (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \cap J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_r : r + d_r \textit{ even})$

Proof. Examining the proof of lemma 8 it is clear that the lemma will follow immediately from the claim that $d_\gamma x_r = d_\gamma i(x_r|_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*})$ for all $\gamma \in (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$. Fix such a γ. Let B_0 and B_1 be bases for $\mathfrak{k}_e$ and $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ respectively. Write x_r as a finite sum $\sum_{k=1}^m c_k M_k$ where $c_k \in \mathbb{K}$ and M_k is a monomial in the $\mathfrak{g}_e$-basis $B_0 \cup B_1$. Once again examining the proof of lemma 7 we see that the current lemma shall follow from the claim that each monomial M_k has an even number of factors from B_0.

Now $r + d_r$ is even so we have two cases: r and d_r are both even or both odd. In the first case $\sigma x_r = x_r$ by proposition 1. We deduce that there must be an even number of factors from B_1 in each M_k. Since d_r is even each M_k has even degree and there are also an even number of factors from B_0, proving the claim. In the second case $\sigma x_r = -x_r$ so there are an odd number of factors from B_1 in each monomial M_k. Since d_r is odd, each M_k has odd degree and so again, each M_k must possess and even number of factors from B_0. ☐

Next we must identify a 2-dimensional plane contained in $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ intersecting $J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even})$ only at zero. The proof will be identical to the symplectic case. Let α and β' be defined exactly as above, however let $\bar{\beta} = \beta - \beta'$ in the current case.

Lemma 12. $\alpha, \bar{\beta} \in (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$.

Proof. Recall that $(\eta_i^{j,s})^* = (\xi_i^{j,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - \varepsilon_{i,j,s}(\xi_{j'}^{i',\lambda_i-1-s})^*$. Following the proof of lemma 9 verbatim, replacing each occurrence of $\zeta_i^{j,s}$ with $\eta_i^{j,s}$, and exchanging the words odd and even, we deduce that $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=i'} a_i(\eta_i^{i,0})^* + \sum_{i<i'} a_i(\eta_i^{i,0})^*$ and $\bar{\beta} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i+1=i'}(\eta_i^{i+1,0})^* + \sum_{i+1\neq i'}(\eta_i^{i+1,0})^*$. $\square$

We can finally give a proof for part (2) of proposition 3. Note that in the following proof we quote lemma 10, although strictly speaking we should alter our argument for lemma 10 slightly: since $\bar{\beta} = \beta - \epsilon\beta'$ we should replace the variety $E = \{t\alpha + (\beta + \sum \varepsilon_{i,i+1,0}t^{k_i}\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i-1}) : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ with $\{t\alpha + (\beta - \sum \varepsilon_{i,i+1,0}t^{k_i}\xi_{(i+1)'}^{i',\lambda_i-1}) : t \in \mathbb{K}\}$ when considering the orthogonal case.

Proof. By lemmas 10 and 12 there is a 2 dimensional plane contained in $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ intersecting J only at zero. By lemma 11 we have $J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even}) = (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \cap J_{\mathfrak{g}_e^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even}) \subseteq (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \cap J$ so that same plane intersects $J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even})$ only at zero. As $J_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*}(x_r : r + d_r \text{ even})$ is conical and Zariski closed, the proposition follows. $\square$

5 Generic Stabalisers

Here we make a quick detour to discuss the existence of generic stabalisers in certain cases. We define generic stabalisers in a general setting. Suppose $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebraic group with identity element ι and $\mathcal{L} = \mathrm{Lie}(\mathcal{A})$. If W is a $\mathbb{K}$-vector space and $\rho : \mathcal{A} \mapsto GL(W)$ is a rational representation then $d_\iota\rho : \mathcal{L} \mapsto \mathfrak{gl}(W)$ is a representation of $\mathcal{L}$. We say that $w \in W$ is a generic point, and that $\mathcal{L}_w$ is a generic stabaliser if there exists a Zariski open subset $\mathcal{O} \subseteq W$ such that for all $u \in \mathcal{O}$, the centralisers $\mathcal{L}_u$ and $\mathcal{L}_w$ are $\mathcal{A}$-conjugate under the adjoint action. In order to apply Skryabin's theorem to a Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}$ with module W we must find

$$q(\mathcal{L}, W) = \dim(W) - \dim(\mathcal{L}) + \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$$

invariant polynomials in $\mathbb{K}[W]$. In order to calculate $\mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$ we shall prove the existence of generic stabalisers in three separate cases. For the coadjoint representation of centralisers in types A and C this result is known in characteristic zero, and $\mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$ has been calculated over $\mathbb{K}$ (see [Yak1]). The main motivation for this section is a calculation of $\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*)$ when $\epsilon = -1$. The following lemma is standard.

Lemma 13. *Fix $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ and let $U_\gamma = \{\gamma' \in W : \mathcal{L}_\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\gamma'}\}$. If*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi : \mathcal{A} \times U_\gamma &\mapsto W; \\ \phi(g, u) &= g \cdot u \end{aligned}$$

is a dominant morphism then γ is a regular, generic point for the action of $\mathcal{A}$ on W.

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{P}$ is an open subset of W contained in $\phi(\mathcal{A} \times U_\gamma)$. It is well known that there exists an open subset $\mathcal{O}$ of W such that the stabalisers of all points in $\mathcal{O}$ have dimension $\mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$ (argue in the style of [Dix], 1.11.5). Then there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{P}$, ie. there exists $\delta' \in U_\gamma$ and $g \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g \cdot \delta' = \delta$ and $\dim(\mathcal{L}_\delta) = \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$. We conclude that

$$\dim(\mathcal{L}_\gamma) \leq \dim(\mathcal{L}_{\delta'}) = \dim(\mathcal{L}_\delta) = \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W)$$

so that γ is regular. For all $\gamma' \in \mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{P}$ we know that $\mathcal{L}_{\gamma'}$ contains some $\mathcal{A}$-conjugate of $\mathcal{L}_\gamma$, say $\mathrm{Ad}(g)\mathcal{L}_\gamma \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\gamma'}$. However by dimension considerations we see that $\mathcal{L}_{\gamma'} = \mathrm{Ad}(g)\mathcal{L}_\gamma$. Therefore $\mathcal{O} \cap \mathcal{P}$ is an open set within which the $\mathcal{L}$-stabalisers of all points are $\mathcal{A}$-conjugate. $\square$

We now return to the context of centralisers in classical Lie algebras. Retain all notations and conventions of the previous sections. Recall that we have a linear form $\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ such that $\alpha \in \mathfrak{k}_e^*$ when $\epsilon = -1$ and $\alpha \in (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ for $\epsilon = 1$ (see lemmas 9 and 12). In section 5 of [Yak1] it is shown that $\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ is a regular element with stabaliser $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i = j\}$, and that α is also regular for the coadjoint representation of $\mathfrak{k}_e$ when $\epsilon = -1$. They go on to prove that α is a generic point over $\mathbb{C}$ in these two cases. Their method makes use of a powerful criterion due to Elashvili, which is particular to characteristic 0 [Ela]. With a little extra work we can use the same technique to extend this result to the characteristic $p > 0$ case.

Theorem 6. *The linear form α is*

1. *a generic, regular point for the action of G_e on $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$;*
2. *a generic, regular point for the action of K_e on $\mathfrak{k}_e^*$ when $\epsilon = -1$;*
3. *a generic, regular point for the action of K_e on $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ when $\epsilon = 1$.*

The method is to satisfy the assumptions of lemma 13. Much as was the case in section 4, the arguments in the symplectic and orthogonal cases are identical. We commence by proving part (1), then part (2) and finally we describe how those arguments may be adapted to the case $\epsilon = 1$. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ where $\mathfrak{n}^- = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i < j\}$, $\mathfrak{h} = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i = j\}$ and $\mathfrak{n}^+ = \mathrm{span}\{\xi_i^{j,s} : i > j\}$. We have an induced decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_e^* = (\mathfrak{n}^-)^* \oplus \mathfrak{h}^* \oplus (\mathfrak{n}^+)^*$ where $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

Proposition 4. *The map $\phi : G_e \times \mathfrak{h}^* \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_e^*; (g, \gamma) \mapsto \mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma$ is dominant.*

Proof. By [Spr], theorem 3.2.20(i), we need only show that the differential $d_\gamma\phi : \mathfrak{g}_e \oplus \mathfrak{k}^* \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ is surjective for some $\gamma \in \mathfrak{k}^*$. We shall take $\gamma = \alpha$. In lemma 1.6 of [TY] the differential is calculated to be

$$d_\alpha\phi(X, v) = \mathrm{ad}^*(X)\alpha + v.$$

To complete the proof we need to show that $(\mathfrak{n}^-)^*, (\mathfrak{n}^+)^* \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{g}_e)\alpha$, where $(\mathfrak{n}^-)^*, (\mathfrak{n}^+)^*$ are defined in lemma 4. A quick calculation shall confirm that

$$\mathrm{ad}^*(\xi_i^{j,s})(\xi_k^{l,r})^* = \delta_{ik}(\xi_j^{l,r-s})^* - \delta_{jl}(\xi_k^{i,r-s})^* \tag{7}$$

and that

$$\mathrm{ad}^*(\xi_i^{j,s})\alpha = a_i(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^* - a_j(\xi_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^*. \tag{8}$$

Fix $i > j$. If $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ then the restriction $a_i \neq a_j$ implies that $(\xi_j^{i,s})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{n}^+)\alpha$ for $s = 0, 1, ..., \lambda_i$. If $\lambda_i < \lambda_j$ then substituting $s = \lambda_j - 1$ into equation (8) gives $(\xi_j^{i,0})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{n}^+)\alpha$. Substituting successively smaller values of s into equation (8) we obtain by induction $(\xi_j^{i,s})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{n}^+)\alpha$ for all $s = 0, 1, ..., \lambda_i - 1$. We conclude that $(\mathfrak{n}^-)^* \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{n}^+)\alpha$. An identical argument shows that $(\mathfrak{n}^+)^* \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{n}^-)\alpha$, completing the proof. ☐

In order to prove analogues of the above proposition for classical subalgebras of $\mathfrak{g}$ we must first put some further restriction on the coefficients a_i which appear in the definition of α. Define

$$l_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = i'; \\ 2 & \text{if } i \neq i'. \end{cases}$$

and impose the restriction $l_i a_i = l_j a_j$ only if $i = j$.

Proposition 5. *The following are true:*

1. *The map* $\phi : K_e \times \mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^* \mapsto \mathfrak{k}_e^*; (g, \gamma) \mapsto \mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma$ *is dominant when* $\epsilon = -1$*;*
2. *The map* $\phi : K_e \times \mathfrak{h}^* \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \mapsto (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*; (g, \gamma) \mapsto \mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma$ *is dominant when* $\epsilon = 1$.

Proof. Let $\epsilon = -1$. We have $\mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^* = \mathrm{span}\{(\zeta_i^{i,s})^*\}$. Once again we may prove that the differential $d_{(\iota,\gamma)}\phi$ is surjective at some point $(\iota, \gamma) \in K_e \times \mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^*$ by [Spr], theorem 3.2.20(i). By lemma 1.6 of [TY] we have $d_{(\iota,\gamma)}\phi(X, v) = \mathrm{ad}^*(X)\gamma + v$. We shall take $\gamma = \alpha$ and $\iota \in K_e$ to be the identity element then we may complete the proof by showing that $\mathrm{span}\{(\zeta_i^{j,s}) : i \neq j\} \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$. For this we shall need some explicit calculations. From formula (7) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ad}^*(\zeta_i^{j,s})(\zeta_k^{l,r})^* &= \delta_{ik}(\zeta_j^{l,\lambda_j-1+r-s})^* - \delta_{jl}(\zeta_k^{i,\lambda_i-1+r-s})^* \\ &+ \delta_{il'}\varepsilon_{klr}(\zeta_j^{k',\lambda_j-1+r-s})^* - \delta_{jk'}\varepsilon_{klr}(\zeta_{l'}^{i,\lambda_i-1+r-s})^* \end{aligned}$$

Recall the equality derived in the proof of lemma 9

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=i'} a_i(\zeta_i^{i,0})^* + \sum_{i<i'} a_i(\zeta_i^{i,0})^* = \sum_{i\leq i'}(1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i,i'})a_i(\zeta_i^{i,0})^*.$$

We have $\varepsilon_{i,i,0} = (-1)^{\lambda_i}$. As an immediate consequence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ad}^*(\zeta_i^{j,s})\alpha &= (1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i,i'})a_i(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - (1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{j,j'})a_j(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^* \\ &- \varepsilon_{i',i',0}(1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i,i'})a_{i'}(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - \varepsilon_{j',j',0}(1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{j,j'})a_j(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^* \\ &= (1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{i,i'})(a_i + (-1)^{\lambda_i}a_{i'})(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - (1 - \frac{1}{2}\delta_{j,j'})(a_j + (-1)^{\lambda_j}a_{j'})(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^* \end{aligned}$$

By lemma 1, λ_i is even if and only if $i = i'$. Furthermore, $a_i = a_{i'}$ when $i = i'$ and $a_i = -a_{i'}$ when $i \neq i'$. In either case $a_i + (-1)^{\lambda_i}a_{i'} = 2a_i$. We deduce that

$$\mathrm{ad}^*(\zeta_i^{j,s})\alpha = l_i a_i(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - l_j a_j(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^*.$$

Fix $i \neq j$. Suppose $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$. Then the restrictions imposed on the coefficients a_i and l_i ensure that $(\zeta_j^{i,s})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$ for $s = 0, 1, ..., \lambda_i - 1$. Now suppose $\lambda_i < \lambda_j$. Taking $s = 0$ we get $-l_j a_j(\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$. Taking successively larger values of s we obtain $\zeta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s} \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$ for $s = 0, 1, ..., \lambda_i - 1$ by induction. Now suppose $\lambda_i > \lambda_j$. By part 3 of lemma 2 we have $\zeta_i^{j,s} = \varepsilon_{i,j,s}\zeta_{j'}^{i',s}$. Also $\lambda_i > \lambda_j$ implies $i < j$. If $i' = j$ then $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$ hence we may assume $j' \neq i < j$ so that $i' < j'$. But now $\zeta_i^{j,s} = \varepsilon_{i,j,s}(\zeta_{j'}^{i',s})^* \in \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$ by our previous deductions. We conclude that $\mathrm{span}\{(\zeta_i^{j,s})^* : i \neq j\} \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$ and $d_{(\iota,\gamma)}\phi(\mathfrak{k}_e, \mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^*) = \mathfrak{k}_e^*$. This proves (1).

The argument for (2) is almost identical. Let $\epsilon = 1$ and define $\phi : K_e \times \mathfrak{h}^* \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \mapsto (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ by $\phi(g, \gamma) = \mathrm{Ad}^*(g)\gamma$. In order to show that $d_\alpha\phi$ is surjective we must prove that $\mathrm{span}\{(\eta_i^{j,s})^* : i \neq j\} \subseteq \mathrm{ad}^*(\mathfrak{k}_e)\alpha$. Following a similar line of deduction to the above we deduce that

$$\mathrm{ad}^*(\zeta_i^{j,s})\alpha = l_i a_i(\eta_j^{i,\lambda_j-1-s})^* - l_j a_j(\eta_j^{i,\lambda_i-1-s})^*.$$

The proof then concludes in the same manner as that of part (1), making use of part 4 of lemma 2. ☐

We may now supply a proof theorem 6.

Proof. In the notation of lemma 13 we must show that $\phi : G_e \times U_\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ is dominant where $U_\alpha = \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* : (\mathfrak{g}_e)_\alpha \subseteq (\mathfrak{g}_e)_\gamma\}$. By theorems 1 & 5 of [Yak1] we see that $(\mathfrak{g}_e)_\alpha = \mathfrak{h}$. Since $\mathfrak{h}$ is abelian, any linear form $\gamma \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is annihilated by $\mathfrak{h}$. As such $\mathfrak{h}^* \subseteq U_\alpha$. By proposition 4 the map $\phi|_{G_e \times \mathfrak{h}^*}$ is dominant, and so too is ϕ. By lemma 13 part (1) of the theorem follows.

The proofs of part (2) and (3) are similar. Let $\epsilon = -1$ and let ϕ be defined as per the statement of the theorem. Then $(\mathfrak{k}_e)_\alpha = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k}_e$. Since $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k}_e$ is abelian, $\mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^* \subseteq U_\alpha = \{\gamma \in \mathfrak{k}_e^* : (\mathfrak{k}_e)_\alpha \subseteq (\mathfrak{k}_e)_\gamma\}$. By proposition 5 the map $\phi|_{K_e \times (\mathfrak{h}^* \cap \mathfrak{k}_e^*)}$ is dominant, so too is ϕ. By lemma 13 part (2) follows.

For part (3) let $\epsilon = 1$ and note that $\mathfrak{h} \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1$ is an abelian Lie algebra so $\mathfrak{h}^* \cap (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* \subseteq U_\alpha = \{\gamma \in (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* : (\mathfrak{k}_e)_\alpha \subseteq (\mathfrak{k}_e)_\gamma\}$. The proof concludes as above. ☐

Corollary 4. $\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*) = \frac{1}{2}(N - |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)$ *when* $\epsilon = 1$.

Proof. By part (3) of theorem 6 we know that $\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*) = \dim((\mathfrak{k}_e)_\alpha) = \dim(\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{k}_e) = \dim \mathrm{span}\{\zeta_i^{i,s} : 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq s < \lambda_i\}$. Now $\zeta_i^{i,s} = 0$ only if $\xi_i^{i,\lambda_i - 1 - s} = -\varepsilon_{i,i,s}\xi_{i'}^{i',\lambda_i - 1 - s}$, which is only if $i = i'$ and $\varepsilon_{i,i,s} = 1$. In this case λ_i is odd by lemma 1 and $\varepsilon_{i,i,s} = (-1)^{\lambda_i - s} = 1$ implies s is odd. Hence for each $i = i'$ we obtain $\frac{\lambda_i - 1}{2}$ nonzero maps $\zeta_i^{i,s}$. In case $i \neq i'$ we have the relations $\zeta_i^{i,s} = \varepsilon_{i,i,s}\zeta_{i'}^{i',s}$ by part 3 of lemma 2. Since these are the only relations we have $\dim \mathrm{span}\{\zeta_i^{i,s}, \zeta_{i'}^{i',s} : 0 \leq s < \lambda_i\} = \lambda_i$ for each pair (i, i') with $i \neq i'$. Since λ_i is even in this case we conclude that $\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*) = \sum_i \lfloor \frac{\lambda_i}{2} \rfloor = \frac{1}{2}(N - |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)$. ☐

6 Mil'ner's Map

In order to deduce theorem 3 from theorem 1 we prove the existence of an isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}_x$-modules $\beta : U(\mathcal{L}_x) \mapsto S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ with special properties. This map is known to exist for a large class of algebras and for the reader's convenience we shall briefly discuss the construction in generality. We must temporarily introduce another algebraic group $\mathcal{B}$ with Lie algebra $\mathcal{M}$. Continue to let $V = \mathbb{K}^N$. Suppose $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq GL(V)$ so that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. We consider $U(\mathcal{L})$ and $S(\mathcal{L})$ to be subalgebras of $U(\mathcal{M})$ and $S(\mathcal{M})$ in the obvious way.

Let $v_1, ..., v_m$ be an $\mathcal{M}$-basis. In order to ease notation we identify each v_i with its image in $U(\mathcal{M})$ under the canonical embedding. Then $U(\mathcal{M})$ is spanned as a $\mathbb{K}$-module by the ordered monomials $v_{j_1} ... v_{j_M}$ with $1 \leq j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_M \leq m$ and $0 \leq M$ (by convention $v_{j_1} ... v_{j_M} = 1$ for $M = 0$). We define a map $U(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto S(U(\mathcal{M}))$ as follows. If $I \subseteq \{1, ..., M\}$ then $v_I = \prod_{k \in I} v_{j_k}$ is the monomial in $U(\mathcal{M})$, ordered as above. Let $\circ$ denote symmetric multiplication in $S(U(\mathcal{M}))$.

We define our map

$$\mu(v_{j_1} ... v_{j_M}) = \sum_{I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k = \{1, ..., M\}} v_{I_1} \circ v_{I_2} \circ \cdots \circ v_{I_k}$$

extending to all of $U(\mathcal{M})$ by linearity. Note that we do not distinguish two partitions $I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k = I'_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I'_k = \{1, ..., M\}$ if there exists $\tau \in S_k$ such that $I_j = I'_{\tau j}$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$. The above is known as Mil'ner's map, and is $\mathcal{B}$-equivariant by construction.

We say that $\mathcal{B}$ possesses Richardson's property if the following holds: *there exists a subspace* $U \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ *such that* $\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \mathcal{M} \oplus U$ *and* $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathcal{B})U \subseteq U$. If $\mathcal{M}$ posses this property then we may construct a map $S(U(\mathcal{M})) \mapsto U(\mathcal{M})$ as follows. Denote by $\rho : \mathcal{M} \mapsto \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ the representation associated to the inclusion $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. There is a unique representation $U(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto \mathrm{End}(V)$ restricting to ρ on $\mathcal{M}$, which we shall also denote by ρ. Let $\epsilon : U(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto \mathbb{K}$ denote the augmentation map, let $U_+(\mathcal{M}) = \mathrm{Ker}(\epsilon)$ and let pr_1 denote the projection onto the first factor of the decomposition $\mathfrak{gl}(V) = \rho(\mathcal{M}) \oplus U$. Then we define

$$\pi = \rho^{-1} \circ \mathrm{pr}_1 \circ (\rho - \epsilon \mathrm{Id}_V) : S(U(\mathcal{M})) \mapsto U(\mathcal{M}).$$

Of course $\rho - \epsilon\ \mathrm{Id}_V$ maps $U(\mathcal{M})$ into $\mathrm{End}(V)$, which is equal to $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ as an $\mathcal{B}$-module. The map π induces a $\mathcal{B}$-module homomorphism, $S(\pi) : S(U(\mathcal{M})) \mapsto S(\mathcal{M})$ and we may compose with μ to obtain

$$\beta = S(\pi) \circ \mu : U(\mathcal{M}) \mapsto S(\mathcal{M}).$$

Consider the canonical filtration on $U(\mathcal{M})$ with $\mathbb{K} = U^{(0)}(\mathcal{M}) \subset U^{(1)}(\mathcal{M}) \subset U^{(2)}(\mathcal{M}) \subset \cdots$. The associated graded algebra is $\mathrm{gr}U(\mathcal{M}) \cong S(\mathcal{M})$ with corresponding grading $S(\mathcal{M}) = \oplus_{i=1}^k S^i(\mathcal{M})$ where $S^i(\mathcal{M})$ denotes the span of homogeneous monomials of degree i in $S(\mathcal{M})$. Since each graded $\mathcal{B}$-algebra is also a filtered $\mathcal{B}$-algebra both $U(\mathcal{M})$ and $S(\mathcal{M})$ can be seen as filtered $\mathcal{B}$-modules. We say that a subalgebra $\mathcal{L}$ is *saturated* if $\pi(U_+(\mathcal{L})) \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. The map β has wonderful properties, which may be stated in the context of saturated subalgebras of $\mathcal{M}$.

Proposition 6. *[Pre, 3.4 & 3.5] Suppose $\mathcal{M}$ posses Richardson's property and that $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ is saturated. Then*

$$\beta : U(\mathcal{L}) \mapsto S(\mathcal{L})$$

is a filtration preserving isomorphism of $\mathcal{A}$-modules. Furthermore,

$$\beta(v_{j_1}...v_{j_M}) = \beta(v_{j_1})...\beta(v_{j_M}) \bmod S^{(M-1)}(\mathcal{L})$$

so that the associated graded map gr β : gr $(U(\mathcal{L})) \cong S(\mathcal{L}) \mapsto$ gr $(S(\mathcal{L})) \cong S(\mathcal{L})$ is the identity on $S(\mathcal{L})$. In particular this map exists for centralisers in all classical Lie algebras.

To clarify the role of $\mathcal{M}$ in the context of classical lie algebras we should mention that $\mathfrak{g}_e$ is a saturated subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$, and the latter trivially possesses Richardson's property, and $\mathfrak{k}_e$ is a saturated subalgebra of $\mathfrak{k}$, which also possesses that property thanks to the $\mathfrak{k}$-invariant decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$. However $\mathcal{M}$ shall play no part in what follows. All we shall need is the existence of the map β for our algebras of interest. See also [FP] for a discussion of the statement regarding graded maps.

Remark 2. *The proof of proposition 6 given in [Pre] uses a slightly more common version of Richardson's property which does not involve the algebraic group $\mathcal{B}$, and the map β is shown to be* $\mathrm{ad}(\mathcal{L})$*-equivariant. By imposing the restriction that $\mathcal{B}$ must stabalise a complement to $\mathcal{M}$ in $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ we may infer the stronger statement that β is* $\mathrm{Ad}(\mathcal{B})$*-equivariant.*

7 Proof of the Main Theorems

7.1 Symmetric Invariants, Centres and the KW1 Conjecture

The deductions of sections 2 to 5 aim to satisfy the assumptions of a theorem of S. Skryabin. We shall record here the first part of that theorem, which is sufficient for our purposes.

Theorem 7. *[Skr] 5.4(i)*
Suppose that W is a smooth affine variety and $\mathcal{L}$ is a p-Lie algebra acting upon $\mathbb{K}[W]$ by derivations. Let $f_1, ..., f_m \in \mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{L}}$ where

$$m = q(\mathcal{L}, W) = \dim(W) - \dim(\mathcal{L}) + \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}, W).$$

Denote by U the closed set of those $w \in W$ such that the differentials $d_w f_1, ..., d_w f_m$ are linearly dependent. If $\operatorname{codim}_W U \geq 2$ then

$$\mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathbb{K}[W]^p[f_1, ..., f_m]$$

and $\mathbb{K}[W]$ is free of rank p^m over $\mathbb{K}[W]^p$.

The algebra $\mathbb{K}[W]^p = \{f^p : f \in \mathbb{K}[W]\}$ is called the p^{th} power subalgebra of $\mathbb{K}[W]$. Before we can apply this theorem we shall need a lemma.

Lemma 14. *The following are true:*

1. $q(\mathfrak{g}_e, \mathfrak{g}_e^*) = N$;
2. $q(\mathfrak{k}_e, \mathfrak{k}_e^*) = |\{x_r : r \text{ even}\}| = N/2$ *when* $\epsilon = -1$;
3. $q(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*) = |\{x_r : r + d_r \text{ even}\}| = (N + |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)/2$ *when* $\epsilon = 1$.

Proof. Since $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e) = \dim(\mathfrak{g}_e^*)$ we have $q(\mathfrak{g}_e, \mathfrak{g}_e^*) = \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e, \mathfrak{g}_e^*)$. By [Yak1] $\operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e, \mathfrak{g}_e^*) = N$ whence (1). Similarly $q(\mathfrak{k}_e, \mathfrak{k}_e^*) = \operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, \mathfrak{k}_e^*)$. If $\epsilon = -1$ then by [Yak1] $\operatorname{ind}(\mathfrak{k}_e, \mathfrak{k}_e^*) = N/2$ which is equal to $|\{1 \leq r \leq N : r \text{ even}\}|$, whence (2). Now let $\epsilon = 1$. By [AO] 3.2(3) we have

$$\dim(\mathfrak{k}_e) = \frac{1}{2}(\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e) - |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|).$$

Since $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* = \dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1 = \dim \mathfrak{g}_e - \dim \mathfrak{k}_e$ we have $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^* - \dim \mathfrak{k}_e = |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|$. By corollary 4 we get $q(\mathfrak{k}_e, (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*) = \frac{1}{2}(N + |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|)$. We must show that this number equals $|\{1 \leq r \leq N : r + d_r \text{ even}\}|$.

Partition the set $\{1, ..., N\}$ into disjoint subsets $\mathcal{I}_i = \{1 \leq r \leq N : d_r = i\}$ where $i = 1, ..., n$. It is clear that $|\mathcal{I}_i| = \lambda_i$. By the definition of the sequence $d_1, d_2, ..., d_N$ we have $r \in \mathcal{I}_i$ if and only if

$$0 < r - \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k \leq \lambda_i. \tag{9}$$

If $i \neq i'$ then $|\mathcal{I}_i| = \lambda_i$ is even by lemma 1. In this case, regardless of the parity of d_r there are exactly $\lambda_i/2$ values r fulfilling (9) with $r + d_r$ even. Now suppose $i = i'$ so that $|\mathcal{I}_i| = \lambda_i$ is odd. We consider two cases: i odd or i even. In the first case there must be an even number of indexes j with $1 \leq j < i$ and $j = j'$, since $j' \in \{j-1, j, j+1\}$. Thus there an even number of indexes $1 \leq j < i$ with λ_j odd by lemma 1. We deduce that $\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k$ is even. If $r \in \mathcal{I}_i$ so that $d_r = i$, then $r + d_r$ even implies r is odd. Thus there are exactly $(\lambda_i + 1)/2$ values of r fulfilling (9) with $r + d_r$ even. Now suppose $i = i'$ and i is even. Similar to the case i odd, there must be an odd number of indexes $1 \leq j < i$ with λ_j odd. Thus $\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k$ is odd. For $r \in \mathcal{I}_i$, If $r + d_r$ is even then r is even. Thus there are exactly $(\lambda_i + 1)/2$ values of r fulfilling (9) with $r + d_r$ even. We conclude that

$$|\{1 \leq r \leq N : r + d_r \text{ even}\}| = \sum_{i \neq i'} \lambda_i/2 + \sum_{i = i'} (\lambda_i + 1)/2 = \frac{1}{2}(N + |\{i : \lambda_i \text{ odd}\}|).$$

□

We may now assemble our deductions and prove theorems 1 and 2. See the introduction for a statement of those theorems. The proofs are identical and so we shall unify notation as follows.

1. **Case 1:** $\mathcal{A} = G$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathfrak{g}$, $X = \{x_1, ..., x_N\}$ and $W = \mathfrak{g}_e^*$;

2. **Case 2:** $\mathcal{A} = K$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathfrak{k}$, $X = \{x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : r \text{ even}\}$, $W = \mathfrak{k}_e^*$ and $\epsilon = -1$,;
3. **Case 3:** $\mathcal{A} = K$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathfrak{k}$, $X = \{x_r|_{(\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*} : r + d_r \text{ even}\}$, $W = (\mathfrak{g}_e)_1^*$ and $\epsilon = 1$.

In all three cases let $e \in \mathcal{L}$ be a nilpotent element. We recall that it suffices to prove theorem 1 in the nilpotent case.

Proof. 1. $\mathcal{L}_e$ is a p-Lie algebra with p^{th} power map induced my matrix multiplication. Apply Skryabin's theorem. Corollary 1 asserts that the polynomials X are indeed $\mathcal{A}_e$-invariant each case. Lemma 14 and corollary 3 together tell us $q(\mathcal{L}_e, W) = |X|$ as required. Propositions 2 and 3 confirm that the condition on codimension of the Jacobian locus is satisfied.

2. Use induction on the polynomial degree of $f \in \mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{A}_e}$. If $\deg(f) < p$ then by part (1), $f \in \mathbb{K}[X]$. Suppose $\deg(f) \geq p$ and that all $g \in \mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{A}_e}$ with $\deg(g) < \deg(f)$ actually lie in $\mathbb{K}[X]$. By part (1) each $f \in \mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{A}_e}$ is a sum of monomials in X with coefficients in $\mathbb{K}[W]^p$, finitely many nonzero. Since f and all monomials in X are fixed by $\mathcal{A}_e$ we deduce that each coefficient is also fixed by $\mathcal{A}_e$. Since $(\mathbb{K}[W]^p)^{\mathcal{A}_e} = (\mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{A}_e})^p$ we conclude by induction that each coefficient is a p^{th} power of an element of $\mathbb{K}[X]$. It follows that $f \in \mathbb{K}[X]$.

3. This follows quickly from parts (1) and (2) given that the $\mathbb{K}[W]^p$-basis of $\mathbb{K}[W]^{\mathcal{L}_e}$ consists of $\mathcal{A}_e$-invariants.

□

Our remaining results regard the centre of the enveloping algebra. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an algebraic group of rank l of type A or C and $x \in \mathcal{L}$. Since x is arbitrary we no longer have explicit presentations for the generators of $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]^{\mathcal{A}_x}$. Nonetheless we shall continue to denote the set of algebraically independent generators by X. Identify $\mathbb{K}[\mathcal{L}_x^*]$ with $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$, and recall that β denotes the filtration preserving isomorphism of $\mathcal{L}_x$-modules from $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ to $S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and the associated graded map gr $\beta : S(\mathcal{L}_x) \mapsto S(\mathcal{L}_x)$ is the identity (see proposition 6). Let $\tilde{X} = \beta^{-1}X$. We now supply a proof for theorem 3.

Proof. 1. Since β is $\mathcal{L}_x$-equivariant we have $\tilde{X} \subseteq Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ so that

$$Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)[\tilde{X}] \subseteq Z(\mathcal{L}_x). \tag{10}$$

Clearly $\text{gr}Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x) = S(\mathcal{L}_x)^p$ so that $S(\mathcal{L}_x)^p[X] \subseteq \text{gr}Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)[\tilde{X}]$, however $S(\mathcal{L}_x)^p[X] = S(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{L}_x}$ by theorem 1. Furthermore $\text{gr}Z(\mathcal{L}_x) \subseteq S(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{L}_x}$ and we may place these inclusions together to obtain

$$\text{gr } Z(\mathcal{L}_x) \subseteq \text{gr } Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)[\tilde{X}].$$

We conclude that the dimensions of the graded components of $\text{gr}Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)[\tilde{X}]$ and $\text{gr}Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ coincide, from whence it follows that inclusion (10) is actually an equality.

2. Let $\langle\tilde{X}\rangle$ denote the subalgebra of $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ generated by $\tilde{X}$. Since β is $\mathcal{A}_x$-equivariant we know that

$$\langle\tilde{X}\rangle \subseteq U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}.$$

Since the graded map associated to β is the identity and X consists of homogeneous polynomials we have gr $\langle\tilde{X}\rangle = \mathbb{K}[X]$. However gr $U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x} =$ gr $\beta(\text{gr } U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}) =$ gr $\beta(U(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x}) =$ gr $\beta(U(\mathcal{L}_x))^{\mathcal{A}_x} =$ gr $S(\mathcal{L}_x)^{\mathcal{A}_x} =$ gr $\mathbb{K}[X] = \mathbb{K}[X]$, from whence the above inclusion is an equality.

3. This follows quickly from parts (1) and (2) given that the $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$-basis of $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ consists of $\mathcal{A}_x$-invariants.

$\square$

As an immediate consequence of the above theorem we are able to confirm the KW1 conjecture for centralisers in types A and C. We retain the notations of the previous proof. Recall that $M(\mathcal{L}_x)$ denotes the maximal dimension of simple $\mathcal{L}_x$ modules and that $\mathrm{char}(\mathbb{K}) > 2$ when $\mathcal{A}$ is of type C.

Corollary 5. *If $\mathcal{L}$ is of type A or C and $x \in \mathcal{L}$ then the KW1 conjecture holds for $\mathcal{L}_x$:*

$$M(\mathcal{L}_x) = p^{\frac{\dim(\mathcal{L}_x) - \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}_x)}{2}}.$$

We supply two proofs for the above corollary. The first of these is more general and applies to centralisers in types A and C whilst the second is more representation theoretic and gives some indication of how modules of dimensions $M(\mathcal{L}_x)$ might be constructed, however this second proof only applies only in the case x nilpotent with $\mathcal{L}$ of type A. Both proofs follow from theorem 3.

Proof. Let F and F_p denote the fields of fractions of $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ respectively. We identify F_p with a subfield of F. Let $\mathrm{Frac}(U(\mathcal{L}_x)) = U(\mathcal{L}_x) \otimes_{Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)} F_p$ be the localisation of $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ at $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$. It is a classical result due to Zassenhaus that $M(\mathcal{L}_x)^2 = \dim_F \mathrm{Frac}(U(\mathcal{L}_x))$ [Zas], theorems 1 & 6. On the other hand $\dim_{F_p} \mathrm{Frac}(U(\mathcal{L}_x)) = p^{\dim(\mathcal{L}_x)}$ since $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ is free of rank $p^{\dim(\mathcal{L}_x)}$ over $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Combining these statements we obtain $p^{\dim(\mathcal{L}_x)} = M(\mathcal{L}_x)^2 \dim_{F_p} F$. We conclude that $\dim_{F_p} F = p^r$ for some r and that

$$M(\mathcal{L}_x) = p^{\frac{1}{2}(\dim(\mathcal{L}_x) - r)}.$$

Therefore the KW1 conjecture is equivalent to the statement $r = \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Let $F' = F_p[\tilde{X}] = Z(\mathcal{L}_x) \otimes_{Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)} F_p$. Clearly $F' \subseteq F$. We claim that this inclusion is actually an equality. It will suffice to prove that every element of F can be written in the form f/g where $f \in Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $g \in Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Part 1 of theorem 3 tells us that $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ is a finitely generated $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$-module, hence F is integral over $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$. Suppose $f/g \in F$. We have $a_n g^n + a_{n-1} g^{n-1} + \cdots + a_0 = 0$ for certain coefficients $a_i \in Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ with $a_0 \neq 0$. We conclude that

$$\frac{f}{g} = \frac{f(a_n g^{n-1} + a_{n-1} g^{n-2} + \cdots + a_1)}{g(a_n g^{n-1} + a_{n-1} g^{n-2} + \cdots + a_1)} = \frac{f(a_n g^{n-1} + a_{n-1} g^{n-2} + \cdots + a_1)}{-a_0} \in F'.$$

Therefore $F = F'$. As a consequence the monomials $\prod_{z \in \tilde{X}} z^{k_z}$ with $0 \leq k_z < p$ form a basis for F over F_p so $\dim_{F_p}(F) = p^l$. Therefore $r = l$. Finally, by [Yak1] $l = \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and the claim follows. $\square$

Before we record a second proof of the corollary we must first recall the rudiments of reduced enveloping algebras. If W is a simple $\mathcal{L}_x$-module then Schur's lemma asserts that $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ acts upon W by scalars. In particular, $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ acts by scalars. The semilinearity of the p^{th}-power map $v \mapsto v^{[p]}$ implies that for each such module W there exists $\chi \in \mathcal{L}_x^*$ fulfilling $(v^p - v^{[p]})w = \chi(v)^p w$ for all $v \in \mathcal{L}_x, w \in W$. We call χ the p-character of W and define the reduced enveloping algebra

$$U_\chi(\mathcal{L}_x) = U(\mathcal{L}_x)/I_\chi$$

where I_χ denotes the (left and right) ideal of $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ generated by expressions of the form $v^p - v^{[p]} - \chi(v)^p$ with $v \in \mathcal{L}_x$. Every simple $\mathcal{L}_x$-module with p-character χ is canonically a simple $U_\chi(\mathcal{L}_x)$-module and vice versa. We must remind the reader that the following proof applies only to the case x nilpotent and $\mathcal{A} = GL(V)$. As such we shall retain the notations of the introduction.

Proof. Define

$$\Omega = \{\chi \in \mathfrak{g}_e^* : \dim(W) = M(\mathfrak{g}_e) \text{ for all simple } U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e)\text{-modules } W\}$$

Let $\chi \in \mathfrak{g}_e^*$. Every automorphism τ of $\mathfrak{g}_e$ induces a vector space isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}_e^* \mapsto \mathfrak{g}_e^*$, via $\tau(\chi(v)) = \chi(\tau^{-1}v)$, and an isomorphism of reduced enveloping algebras

$$U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e) \xrightarrow{\sim} U_{\tau(\chi)}(\mathfrak{g}_e)$$

Hence Ω is G_e-stable. In [PS], proposition 4.2 (1), it was shown that Ω is a non-empty Zariski open subset of $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$. By theorem 6 there exists a nonempty open subset $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_e^*$ such that the $\mathfrak{g}_e$-stabalisers of points in $\mathcal{O}$ are G_e-conjugate to $\mathfrak{h} = \{\xi_i^{i,\lambda_i-1-s} : 0 \leq s < \lambda_i\}$. Since $\mathfrak{h}$ is abelian the stabalisers of points in $\mathfrak{h}^*$ include $\mathfrak{h}$.

Hence we can find $\chi \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{h}^*$, ie. a linear function vanishing on $(\mathfrak{n}^-)^*$ and $(\mathfrak{n}^+)^*$ with the additional property that every irreducible $U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e)$-module has dimension $M(\mathfrak{g}_e)$. Identify χ with its restriction to $\mathfrak{h}^*$. The decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}_e$ and $\mathfrak{g}_e^*$ induces a decomposition of enveloping algebras

$$U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e) = U_0(\mathfrak{n}^-) \otimes U_\chi(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes U_0(\mathfrak{n}^+)$$

Let W be a simple $U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e)$-module so that $\dim(W) = M(\mathfrak{g}_e)$. By Engel's theorem $\mathfrak{n}^+$ has a common eigenvector in W of eigenvalue 0 and $\mathfrak{h}$ acts diagonally on $W^{\mathfrak{n}^+} \neq 0$. We can find a 1-dimensional $U_\chi(\mathfrak{h}) \otimes U_0(\mathfrak{n}^+)$-module $\mathbb{K}w_\mu \subseteq W^{\mathfrak{n}^+}$ where $hw_\mu = \mu(h)w_\mu$ for all $h \in \mathfrak{h}$.

The induced module $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{n}^+}^{\mathfrak{g}_e}(\mathbb{K}w_\mu) = U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e) \otimes_{U_\chi(\mathfrak{h})\otimes U_0(\mathfrak{n}^+)} \mathbb{K}w_\mu$ has dimension $\dim(U_0(\mathfrak{n}^-)) = p^{\dim(\mathfrak{n}^-)}$. We have $\dim(\mathfrak{n}^-) = \dim(\mathfrak{n}^+)$ and $\dim(\mathfrak{h}) = N = \mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e)$ by [Yak1], theorem 1. From $\mathfrak{g}_e = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ we obtain $\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e) = 2\dim(\mathfrak{n}^-) + \mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e)$. Therefore

$$\dim(\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{n}^+}^{\mathfrak{g}_e}(\mathbb{K}w_\mu)) = p^{\frac{1}{2}(\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)-\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e))}.$$

By standard theory of induced modules W is a homomorphic image of $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{n}^+}^{\mathfrak{g}_e}(\mathbb{K}w_\mu)$ so the dimension of the former is bounded above by that of the latter. According to theorem 5.4(2) of [PS] it is possible to choose χ so that all finite dimensional $U_\chi(\mathfrak{g}_e)$-modules have dimension divisible by $p^{\frac{1}{2}(\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)-\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e))}$. This ensures that $W = \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{n}^+}^{\mathfrak{g}_e}(\mathbb{K}w_\mu)$, and that $M(\mathfrak{g}_e) = p^{\frac{1}{2}(\dim(\mathfrak{g}_e)-\mathrm{ind}(\mathfrak{g}_e))}$. □

Remark 3. *Although our second proof is much less general it does have the virtue of implying that the Verma modules for* $\mathfrak{g}_e$ *are generically simple.*

7.2 The Zassenhaus Variety

Retain the notations of theorem 3. In this final section we bring together some related results to offer an algebraic characterisation of the singular points on the Zassenhaus variety $\mathcal{Z} = \mathrm{Specm}Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$.

Theorem 8. *If* $\mathcal{L}$ *is a simple Lie algebra of type* A *or* C *over* $\mathbb{K}$ *and* $x \in \mathcal{L}$ *then* $\mathfrak{m}$ *is a smooth point of* $\mathcal{Z}$ *if and only if* $U(\mathcal{L}_x)/\mathfrak{m}U(\mathcal{L}_x) \cong \mathrm{Mat}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)}(\mathbb{K})$.

Proof. Recall that the singular locus $(\mathcal{L}_x^*)_{\mathrm{sing}}$ is defined to be the set of all $\chi \in \mathcal{L}_x^*$ such that $\dim((\mathcal{L}_x)_\chi) > \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{L}_x)$. By [PPY] theorems 3.4 & 3.11, $\mathrm{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}(\mathcal{L}_x^*)_{\mathrm{sing}} \geq 2$ provided x is nilpotent. We should note that the characteristic zero assumption is never used throughout those deductions. If $x = n + s$ is the Jordan decomposition of x into its nilpotent and semisimple parts then $\mathcal{L}_x = (\mathcal{L}_s)_n$. It is well known that $\mathcal{L}_s$ is reductive with simple components of types A and C. Write $\mathcal{L}_s = \mathcal{L}_1 \oplus \cdots \mathcal{L}_k \oplus \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{L}_s)$ where the $\mathcal{L}_i$ denote the simple components of $\mathcal{L}_s$ and $\mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{L}_s)$ denotes the centre and write $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_k$ with $n_i \in \mathcal{L}_i$. If $\chi = \chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_k + \chi_{\text{cen}} \in \mathcal{L}_x^*$ with $\chi_i \in (\mathcal{L}_i)^*_{n_i}$ and $\chi_{\text{cen}} \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathcal{L}_s)^*$ then $\chi \in (\mathcal{L}_x^*)_{\text{sing}}$ if and only if $\chi_i \in ((\mathcal{L}_i)^*_{n_i})_{\text{sing}}$ for some i. We conclude that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}(\mathcal{L}_x^*)_{\text{sing}} \geq 2$ for all $x \in \mathcal{L}$. For a non-negative integer m we let $\mathcal{X}_m$ denote the set of all $\chi \in \mathcal{L}_x^*$ such that $U_\chi(\mathcal{L}_x)$ has a module of finite dimension not divisible by p^m. According to [PS] proposition 5.2, $\dim(\mathcal{X}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)}) \leq \dim(\mathcal{L}^*_{\text{sing}})$, from whence we deduce that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}(\mathcal{X}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)}) \geq 2$.

By [Zas] theorems 5 and 6, we may infer that there is a closed subset $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ such that

$$\mathcal{Z} \backslash \mathcal{C} = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{Z} : U(\mathcal{L}_x)/\mathfrak{m} \cong \text{Mat}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)}(\mathbb{K})\}.$$

The above open set is known as the Azumaya locus of $\mathcal{Z}$. We claim that $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{C} \geq 2$. The inclusion $Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x) \mapsto Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ induces as finite morphism of maximal spectra $\mathcal{Z} \mapsto \text{Specm} Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and by identifying $\text{Specm} Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $\mathcal{L}_x^*$ we obtain a map $\tau : \text{Specm} Z(\mathcal{L}_x) \mapsto \mathcal{L}_x^*$. Explicitly, $\mathfrak{m} \mapsto \chi$ where χ is the linear functional such that $\mathfrak{m} \cap Z_p(\mathcal{L}_x) = \mathfrak{m}_\chi$. This map is closed and has finite fibres so $\text{codim}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{C} = \text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}\tau(\mathcal{C})$. If $\chi \in \tau(\mathcal{C})$ then $U_\chi(\mathcal{L}_x)$ has a module of dimension less than $M(\mathcal{L}_x)$ so that $\chi \in \mathcal{X}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)}$. We conclude that

$$\text{codim}_{\mathcal{Z}}\mathcal{C} = \text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}\tau(\mathcal{C}) \geq \text{codim}_{\mathcal{L}_x^*}\mathcal{X}_{M(\mathcal{L}_x)} \geq 2.$$

Denote by $Z_\mathfrak{m}$ and $U_\mathfrak{m}$ the localisation of $Z(\mathcal{L}_x)$ and $U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ respectively at $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{Z}$ and suppose $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{C}$. Certainly $U_\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite module over $Z_\mathfrak{m}$. Furthermore the unique maximal ideal of $Z_\mathfrak{m}$ is $\mathfrak{m}Z_\mathfrak{m}$ and $U_\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}U_\mathfrak{m} \cong U(\mathcal{L}_x)/\mathfrak{m}U(\mathcal{L}_x)$ is a matrix algebra over its centre $Z/\mathfrak{m}Z \cong \mathbb{K}$. By [DI] theorem 7.1, $U_\mathfrak{m}$ is a separable algebra over its centre $Z_\mathfrak{m}$ (ie. $U_\mathfrak{m}$ is an Azumaya algebra) for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{C}$. Combining these deductions with [BG] 2.2, 2.3, we have satisfied the assumptions of [BG] theorem 3.8. $\square$

8 Two Counterexamples in Orthogonal Algebras

It is natural to ask how the methods used in current article might be adapted to centralisers in types B and D. In this section we offer two counterexamples to theorem 1 for these algebras. We recall that in type C the algebra $S(\mathfrak{k}_e)^{K_e}$ is freely generated by the restrictions $\{x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : 1 \leq 2r \leq N\}$. By contrast we shall show that when $\mathfrak{k}$ is of type B or D:

1. The restrictions $\{x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : 1 \leq 2r \leq N\}$ are not guaranteed to be algebraically independent;
2. The restrictions $\{x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : 1 \leq 2r \leq N\}$ do not always generate the algebra $S(\mathfrak{k}_e)^{K_e}$.

Example 1. *Let*

$$\lambda = (2, 2, \underbrace{1, ..., 1}_{n-2 \text{ times}}).$$

Then $K = SO_{n+2}$, $e(\lambda) \in \mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{so}_{n+2}$ and $Ad(K)e$ is known as the minimal nilpotent orbit. An elementary calculation, making use of lemma 2, will confirm that

$$x_2|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = \zeta_1^{1,0}$$
$$x_4|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = (\zeta_1^{1,0})^2$$

so that the restrictions $\{x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : 1 \leq 2r \leq N\}$ are not algebraically independent.

In §4.4 of [PPY] the restrictions $x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ are considered when $\epsilon = 1$. In the parlance of that paper they show that the invariants $x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ with r even are *good* for e under certain conditions (cf. lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 of [PPY]). This is a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for the application of their method to show that $S(\mathfrak{k}_e)^{K_e}$ is freely generated by those invariants. Here we make the observation that certain of these good systems do not generate the entire invariant algebra. Suppose λ_k is odd for $1 \leq k \leq i$, that $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_{i+1}$ and that i is even. Then certainly $r = \sum_{k=1}^{i} \lambda_k$ is even. Furthermore, $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ may be identified (on a symbolic level) with the i^{th} and final elementary invariant in $S(\mathfrak{k}')^{K'}$ where K' is an orthogonal group of type D with standard representation of dimension i, and $\mathfrak{k}' = Lie(K')$. It is well known that that this invariant is equal to the square of another invariant P, known as the Pfaffian. We deduce that $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = P_r^2$ for some $P_r \in S(\mathfrak{k}_e)^{K_e}$. This observation implies that for certain e there are some invariants not generated by the restrictions $x_r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*}$ with r even. Let us take a concrete example.

Example 2. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_n)$, where λ_1 and λ_2 are both odd and $\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_3$. The invariants $\{x_r : 1 \leq r \leq \lambda_1\}$ are simply powers of e, whilst*

$$x_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} = (\zeta_1^{2,0})^2$$

so that the restrictions $\{x_{2r}|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : 1 \leq 2r \leq N\}$ do not generate the algebra $S(\mathfrak{k}_e)^{K_e}$.

According to theorem 4 of [Yak2] the invariant $P_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2} = \zeta_1^{2,0}$ and the set $\{e^r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : r \geq 0\}$ together span the centre of $\mathfrak{k}_e$. Furthermore, nilpotent elements of this type are the only such elements for which the centre of $\mathfrak{k}_e$ properly includes $\{e^r|_{\mathfrak{k}_e^*} : r \geq 0\}$.

References

[AO] J. P. Anker, B. Orsted, *Lie Theory: Lie Algebras and Representations*, Birkhuser, 2004

[BB] J. Brown, J. Brundan, *Elementary Invariants for Centralizers of Nilpotent Matrices*, J. Aust. Math. Soc. 86, pp. 115, 2009

[BG] K. A. Brown, K. R. Goodearl, *Homological Aspects of Noetherian PI Hopf Algebras and Irreducible Modules of Maximal Dimension*, J. Algebra 198, pp. 240-266, 1997

[CMM] J-V. Charbonnel, A. Moreau, A. Moreau *The Index of Centralizers of Elements of Reductive Lie Algebras*, Doc. Mathematica 15, pp. 347-380, 2010

[DI] F. DeMeyer, E. Ingraham, *Separable Algebras over Commutative Rings*, Lect. notes in math. 181, Springer, 1971

[Dix] J. Dixmier, *Algèbres Enveloppantes*, Gauthier-Villars Éditors, 1974

[Ela] A. G. Elashvili, *Canonical form and stationary subalgebras of points in general position for simple linear Lie groups*, Funkts. Anal. Prilozhen., 6, No. 1, pp. 51-62, 1972; English transl.: Functional Anal. Appl., 6, No. 1, pp. 44-53, 1972

[FP] E. M. Friedlander, B. J. Parshall, *Rational Actions Associated to the Adjoint Representation*, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. 20, pp. 215-226, 1987

[Hum] J. E. Humphreys, *Linear Algebraic Groups*, Springer, 1998

[PPY] D. Panyushev, A. Premet, O.Yakimova, *On Symmetric Invariants of Centralisers in Reductive Lie Algebras*, J Algebra 313, pp. 343-391, 2007

[Pre] A. Premet, *Complexity of Lie Algebra Representations and Nilpotent Elements of Stabalizers*, Math. Z. 228, pp. 255-282, 1998

[PS] A. Premet, S. Skryabin *Representations of Restricted Lie Algebras and Families of Associative L-Algebras*, J. Reine. Agnew. Math. 507, pp. 189-218, 1999

[Ros] M. Rosenlicht, *On Quotient Varieties and the Affine Embedding of Certain Homogeneous Spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 101, pp. 211-223, 1961

[Skr] S. Skryabin, *Invariants of Finite Group Schemes*, J. London Math Soc. (2) 65, pp. 339-360, 2002

[Spr] T. A. Springer, *Linear Algebraic Groups*, Birkhauser, first edition, 1998

[Tan] R. Tange, *The Zassenhaus Variety of Lie Algebras in Positive Characteristic*, arXiv:0811.4568v4 [math.RA], 2009

[TY] P. Tauvel, R. Yu, *Indice et Formes Linéares Stable dans les Algèbres de Lie*, J. Algebra 273, pp. 507-516, 2004

[Vel] F. D. Veldkamp, *The Centre of the Universal Enveloping Algebra of a Lie Algebra in Characteristic p*, Ann. Scient. Ec. Norm. Sup. 4, pp. 217-240, 1972

[Yak1] O. Yakimova, *The Index of Centralizers of Elements in Classical Lie Algebras* Funkts. Anal. Prilozhen., 40, No. 1, pp. 52-64, 2006; English transl.: Functional Anal. Appl., 40, No. 1, pp. 42-51, 2006

[Yak2] O. Yakimova, *Surprising Properties of Centralisers in Classical Lie Algebras*, arXiv:0803.0285v2 [math.RT], 2008

[Yak3] O. Yakimova, *A Counterexample to Premet's and Joseph's Conjectures*, , Bull. London Math. Soc. 39 no.5, pp. 749-754, 2007

[Zas] H. Zassenhaus, *The Representations of Lie Algebras of Prime Characteristic*, Proc. Glasgow Math. Assoc. 2, pp. 1-36, 1954